

IV. MEDICAL ROOM  
UNIVERSITY LIBRARY  
DETROIT, MICH.

SEP 9 1924

VOL. XLV, 3

WHOLE NO. 179

THE

AMERICAN

# JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

Founded by B. L. GILDERSLEEVE

EDITED BY

CHARLES WILLIAM EMIL MILLER

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY

WITH THE COÖPERATION OF

MAURICE BLOOMFIELD, HERMANN COLLITZ, TENNEY FRANK,  
WILFRED P. MUSTARD, D. M. ROBINSON

JULY, AUGUST, SEPTEMBER

1924

BALTIMORE, MARYLAND

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS

Entered as second-class matter October 16, 1911, at the postoffice at Baltimore, Maryland, under  
the Act of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October  
3, 1917. Authorized on July 3, 1918.

## CONTENTS.

---

	<small>PAGE</small>
I.—Vergil's Messianic Expectations. By W. A. HEIDEL,	205
II.—Philological and Archeological Studies. By PAUL HAUPT,	228
III.—On Some Theories Concerning the Composition of the Aeneid. By M. B. OGLE,	260
IV.—Notes on Juvenal, I, III, VI, X. By GERTRUDE HIRST,	276
<b>REPORTS:</b>	<b>284</b>
<i>Hermes</i> , LVIII (1923), pp. 1-239 (HERMAN L. EBELING).— <i>Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica</i> , LI (1923) (W. P. MUSTARD).	
<b>REVIEWS:</b>	<b>291</b>
<i>Louise E. W. Adams' A Study in the Commerce of Latium</i> (GORDON J. LAING).— <i>Lane Cooper's An Aristotelian</i> <i>Theory of Comedy</i> (CHARLES W. PEPPLER).— <i>W. M.</i> <i>Lindsay's Early Latin Verse</i> (GILBERT H. TAYLOR).	
<b>BOOKS RECEIVED:</b>	<b>300</b>

---

The American Journal of Philology is open to original communications in all departments of philology—classical, comparative, oriental, modern; condensed reports of current philological work; summaries of chief articles in the leading philological journals of Europe; reviews by specialists; bibliographical lists. It is published quarterly. Four numbers constitute a volume, one volume each year. Subscription price, \$5.00 a year, payable in advance (foreign postage, 50 cents, extra); single numbers, \$1.50 each.

Articles intended for publication in the Journal, books for review, and other editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Professor C. W. E. Miller, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland.

Subscriptions, remittances and business communications should be sent to

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS, Baltimore, Md.





# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY

---

VOL. XLV, 3

WHOLE No. 179

---

## I.—VERGIL'S MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS.

Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue* has had a most interesting fate. Though its author announced his purpose to sound a higher note (*paulo maiora canamus*), he had in mind the comparison with his strictly bucolic verse, and little dreamed that his song would in time to come be bracketed with the angelic song heard by shepherds guarding their flocks by night on the hills above Bethlehem. Even less did he dream that his song would be quoted at an ecumenical council of adherents of a religion destined in time to have one of its chief centers in Rome, or that it would procure for him the character of its prophet and the honor of serving as guide among the dead for its greatest poet. A poem destined to have such a career has of course excited extraordinary interest: the literature which it has called forth is voluminous and includes many works by eminent scholars. Not the least of these is Eduard Norden's *Die Geburt des Kindes* (Leipzig, B. G. Teubner, 1924). The present article is occasioned by the appearance of this book, but can hardly be called a review of it, because a review would require one to touch upon many points which must here be passed over. It is to be hoped and expected that these other matters will be discussed by one or another of the reviewers, of whom there will surely be no lack.

My purpose is to consider several important questions raised by Norden's book, which my own studies give promise of presenting in a new and different light, and to make some contribution of my own toward an understanding of the historical problem, without referring at every point to Norden's discussion or seeking to distinguish sharply between my views and his,

presupposing that my readers will have read and duly weighed his argument. Nevertheless, I am unwilling to forego the pleasure of signalizing the great merits of a book which deserves and will surely receive unstinted praise from every scholar who reads it.

Everyone who is familiar with the previous works of Professor Norden could easily have guessed wherein the chief value of his study would be found to lie; for he has proved himself an adept in the philologist's art of nice and exact interpretation of texts and an accomplished critic of literary form and tone. If his reviewers should be able to discover serious flaws in *Die Geburt des Kindes*, when considered from these points of view, it would greatly surprise me; for, with the exception of a few points, where I was inclined to question but distrusted my judgment quite as much as his, I noted nothing to criticize. The book, moreover, has a positive merit beyond that of exhibiting the virtues of the accomplished philologist and critic: the charm of its author's style and the contagious warmth of his emotional response to his lofty theme and its time-honored associations lift the reader at times into a sphere far above mere scholarship. It is a book as well as a study.

Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue* furnishes the text to be interpreted and therefore to a certain extent defines the scope of Norden's study, which is essentially a scholion writ large. Now it is in the nature of the scholion that it should be written *ad hoc*. So far as the analysis and strictly philological interpretation of the text is concerned, this origin of the book is wholly to its advantage; but its author shows by the title he has chosen—*Die Geburt des Kindes*—and by the method which he adopts throughout that he is chiefly concerned to trace a tradition to its origins. Regarding the nature of this tradition, one suspects, Professor Norden had not arrived at a perfectly clear conception. An element of permanence is of the essence of a tradition; and in anything which owes its origin and perpetuation to the social nature of man it is not the specific content but the general scheme and form that endures. Norden is conscious of this fact and emphasizes it; but, true to his antecedents, it is almost exclusively the literary form—or formula—to which he looks for the clew. One need not deny the relevancy of such evidence,

where it can be found, to the questions at issue; but every student of human society is well aware that literature—even the religious formula—is a fleeting phenomenon in comparison with other social forms. Institutions (customs, observances, rites) abide when the thought and even the spoken or written formula have become obsolete and lost in oblivion. It is in his effort to trace the tradition embodied in Vergil's *Eclogue* to its origins that Norden shows the inadequacy of his knowledge and method. What the author of *Περὶ θύσις* says of literary criticism—*ἢ γὰρ τῶν λόγων κρίσις πολλῆς ἔστι πείρας τελευταῖον ἐπιγέννημα*—applies with even greater force to historical criticism; for, though it is conceivable that one might be endowed by nature with a judgment in matters of style so nice as to be well-nigh infallible, no one is born with a knowledge of facts such as are requisite to the determination of obscure questions of history. Historical judgment and insight are to be achieved if at all only by long and pains-taking study superadded to natural endowment of no ordinary sort. Above all things an important contribution to the history of ideas is not likely to result from a special study of a given theme—a work *ad hoc*; it is more probably to be expected from an apparently chance insight for which long consideration of many related matters has prepared the way.

In thus characterizing Norden's study as an *opus ad hoc* rather than *πολλῆς πείρας τελευταῖον ἐπιγέννημα*, it is not my intention to stigmatize it as in the ordinary sense uncritical or ill informed. Quite the reverse: the author has read a good deal of the literature that has gathered round his theme and has profited in more than one direction by the counsel and guidance of eminent specialists, a privilege for which a scholar less fortunately situated might well envy him. Nevertheless, eminent specialists may sometimes lead one astray, as when Norden's mentors in Egyptology aided and abetted him in his mistaken tendency to father upon Egypt the entire tradition regarding the *Aἰών* and the divine child. Of this more must be said in the sequel; at present the important point is that this special course of reading has led Norden neither into really new fields, from which he might have gathered decisive facts bearing upon the disputed questions, nor into a high mountain from

which he might have surveyed all the fields, new and old, and coördinated the data collected by specialist pioneers.

So much premised, let us proceed to consider a few of the questions which naturally suggest themselves to the reader of Norden's work. The first, indeed the all-important, question relates to the occasion of Vergil's *Fourth Eclogue*. We know that the poem was addressed to Pollio on the occasion of his inauguration as consul in 40 B. C. The poem itself shows that Vergil's Messianic expectations were connected with that event. The question, which no one to my knowledge has answered, is why "the hopes and fears of all the years" (to quote the Nativity hymn of Phillips Brooks) were met in Rome that night. Norden has of course raised this question, but has given it a mistaken turn by asking why the Sibyl dated the reign of Helios and the beginning of the new Aeon in the year 40 B. C. The obvious retort is that she did not. As Heraclitus said, "the lord whose is the oracle at Delphi neither utters nor hides his meaning, but shows it by a sign." It was even so with the Sibyl; whatever she said—and we do not know just what she said—we may be sure that she indicated the time by some of the customary signs of the end, which had to be interpreted and referred to a particular time. We have therefore to ask why Vergil, and doubtless others with him, came to expect the critical juncture at that precise time, invoking the prophecy of the Cumæan Sibyl.

Norden has well shown that Vergil's poem was intended to be presented to Pollio on the occasion of his inauguration as consul on New Year's day, 40 B. C. It was doubtless composed shortly before that date, on which the old world was to pass away and the new Aeon, beginning under the reign of Helios-Apollo, should restore the golden age of Saturn. Coincident with the new Aeon should come a heaven-descended child, the first-born of many brethren, a new and better race of men. The reign of Helios is probably correctly dated from the *natalis solis*, December 25, and the beginning of the new age, coinciding with the birth of the divine child, on January 6, the γενέθλια Αἰώνος. Of these dates we shall presently have more to say: for the moment it will suffice to point out that both were New Year's days. When one recalls that January 1, falling about midway

between them, was likewise a New Year's day, this redundancy may seem at first surprising and even disconcerting; but those who are familiar with the even greater diversity of New Year epochs in use in Christian lands down to comparatively recent times, and reflect on the variety and number of civilizations that met and merged in ancient Rome, will have no difficulty in comprehending the situation. The Julian reform, extended some years later to Egypt, abated the confusion somewhat in civil affairs, but in religious observances—which are here chiefly in question—the ancient practices continued. In Rome itself the *calendae Martiae* held their place for centuries alongside the *calendae Januariae*.

Though Norden has not pushed his inquiries very far, he does not fail to see that the question regarding the end of one Aeon and the beginning of another is connected both with the calendar and with astrology, or, if one prefers, with astronomy. The Aeon assumes so great an importance in ancient thought just because *time* is so important a factor in ancient religion. One has only to think of the Hebrews' observance of times and seasons to become convinced that their *mo'adim* were the *sacra par excellence* of their religion: though they can be shown to have changed, these appointed seasons have changed less in the course of history than any other factor in their religious life. A comparison of Ar. *Nubes* 615 sq., *Pax* 414 sq., with the Jewish *Book of Jubilees* 6, 32-38 will show at once that Jew and Greek were essentially at one in their feeling, and that both were equally concerned about the calendar. The calendar is of course primarily a religious institution, and even Julius Caesar, when he reformed it, was careful to avoid any dislocation of festivals, preserving with truly religious care the very numbering of every *dies festus*.

If time was all-important, the luminaries which measure time are no less important. The Psalmist says, "He appointed the moon for seasons; the sun knoweth his going down" (which marked the beginning of the sacral day). Sun and moon are indeed the hands of the clock: they are superimposed at twelve o'clock, when they have completed the circuit of the dial. Possibly man may have measured time at first solely by the apparent diurnal revolution of the sun; but among the most primitive

peoples known to us the lunation, as well as the day, is known and religiously observed. The close of the lunation with the ominous days of the dark of the moon presumably furnished the original model for "the last days" of eschatology, when men apprehended the possibility that time should be no more. The crisis, observed with dark rites, once passed, the new moon—herald of a new cycle—was hailed with ecstatic joy. In more highly civilized societies the fateful moment of the possible stoppage of the wheel of time is expected when it reaches, so to speak, a dead center, as several cycles are simultaneously completed. Since the year consisted of an integral number of days and months, and intercalation generally took the form of the occasional or periodic insertion of a whole month, such a crisis recurred at the expiry of every year. The turn of the year was, therefore, a moment when the end of the world might always be expected, and it was marked by certain *rites de passage*, or passovers, intended to prevent the stoppage of the wheel of time. One might cite a long list of rites, now surviving chiefly in the rudimentary form of children's games, which once served magically to keep the wheel in motion, as it threatened to halt at a dead center. As astronomy took cognizance of more and more indicators of time, the calculation became increasingly refined, yielding, besides the solar, sidereal, "great," or Platonic years, to be punctuated by an *ἐκπύρωσις* or other catastrophe. But each refinement in the measurement of time brought with it a practical or theoretical rectification of the calendar: in other words, it called for a more elaborate scheme of intercalation, by which the practical time-pieces employed by man were corrected to coincide with the heavenly clock.

Ancient mythology and legend preserve far more references to this process than are commonly recognized. Cornford, in his contribution to Miss Harrison's *Themis*, was quite right in connecting the feast of Thyestes and the attendant reversal of the sun's course with the Kronia (the *Saturnalia regna*) and the practice of periodic intercalation. Plato, *Polit.* 269 sq., not obscurely suggests the same connection. The myth is regularly associated with a change of dynasty. It is, moreover, unquestionably to be connected, by whatever intermediate links, with the reversal of the sun's course reported in the lapse of Egyptian

history by Herodotus 2. 142, 144, as Campbell has pointed out. In the latter passage it is assumed that no such catastrophes as the flood of Deucalion or the *ἐκπύρωσις* of Phaethon, which visited other lands, afflicted Egypt,<sup>1</sup> where—Egyptologists assure us—there was no myth of the Flood. To the same category belong the behavior of the sun and moon on the occasion of Joshua's victory over the five Amorite Kings at Gibeon, and the return of the shadow ten degrees on the dial of Ahaz in the days of Hezekiah. Diels, *Antike Technik*,<sup>2</sup> p. 156, n. 2, has with great probability explained the latter as referring to a form of the sun-dial found in Egypt; but he failed to see the reference to the practice of intercalation. It would carry us too far afield to enlarge upon this subject at present; but one who will consider the myths of Tantalus, Thyestes, Oenomaus, and Pelops, in relation to the conception of the new Aeon and the birth of the new divine king, will readily convince himself that there is a real connection between them.

Time, of course, begins with creation; and creation, of course, begins on New Year's day of the first year. In the biblical account creation is completed on the sixth day with the creation of man. To the anthropocentric thought of the ancients, however, the creation of man is the real beginning. We thus have two New Year epochs separated by an interval of five days. Of this we shall have more to say presently. Before creation lies chaos, and each completed cycle returns full circle to the beginning; therefore there is chaos and imminent dissolution before each new revolution. The death of one Aeon is the birth of its successor, both occurring—to use a phrase of Lucretius—*tempore puncto*. This is the reason why, *e. g.*, in Jewish eschatology, the distinction between “the last days” and the beginning of the new Messianic kingdom is difficult, or rather impossible. All the “signs” which attended creation are expected to recur at the end of the times. Gunkel well expressed the fact in the title of his excellent book, *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*. When these signs of the end appear, men begin to watch and pray. New Year's Eve has been a time of vigil and supplication from time immemorial. Historians and theo-

<sup>1</sup> See Augustine (Patr. Lat.), 41, 568.

logians are continually laying a false emphasis upon the supposed distress of the last days, and Norden is perplexed to find that at the moment when Vergil expected the birth of the divine child and the new Aeon there were neither wars nor rumors of war, but it was a time of peace.<sup>1\*</sup> One who knows his *Oedipus Rex* and the countless aetiological myths told to account for religious rites will understand that the plagues are not to be taken too literally. Consider the occasions for worship enumerated by Solomon in his prayer for the dedication of his temple.

The astrologers cast the nativity of the world as they did the horoscope of a child. In the beginning they read the end. Hence Roman emperors forbade the casting of nativities—unless they were favorable for themselves. As the first creation had its Adam, each new age was expected to have its new Adam, whose horoscope was that of the age. Both would come in the fulness of time. But who should know the times and seasons? That was the business of the prophet, in Egypt as in Israel. The Psalmist complains (74. 9), "We see not our signs: there is no more any prophet, neither is there among us any that knoweth how long." From first to last the Hebrew prophets have one theme—the day of Jehovah, the day at once of doom and of salvation. What seems to have been overlooked, or but dimly discerned by the theologians, is that the messages—the threats and promises, the curses and blessings—of the prophets of Israel one and all borrow the colors, in which they depict the day of decision, from the hopes and fears of the pilgrimage festivals. But of these festivals we shall have to speak more at length presently.

It does not follow that all prophets were in the strict sense astrologers; but they were all supposed to be able to read the signs of the times. At the end of the times, as we know from the Gospels, false prophets will abound. Christians were warned against heeding them. "And being asked by the Pharisees,

<sup>1\*</sup> The Christian Fathers likewise were troubled by the fact that the birth of Christ fell in a time of peace. See Patr. Lat., 17, 608-9; 120, 122.

when the kingdom of God cometh, [Jesus] answered them and said, The kingdom of God cometh not with observation: neither shall they say, Lo here! or there! for lo, the kingdom of God is within you" (*Luke* 17. 20-21). Nevertheless, Jews and Christians alike expected a great prophet—chiefly Elijah—in the last days. Though the rôle of astrology was not great among the earlier Jews, who knew little of science in any form, Jewish conceptions were dominated by the same thoughts which among other peoples were more precisely formulated, as among the Magi and the Egyptians.

These considerations suggest the true explanation of the expectations regarding the beginning of the new Aeon which found expression in Vergil's Messianic *Eclogue*. Norden points out (p. 31) that the astrological conception of the Aeon was familiar at Rome in the days of Sulla and Caesar. There can be no doubt that it was the serious derangement of the Roman calendar that led men at that time to occupy their minds with such matters. In 46 B. C. Caesar reformed the calendar, inaugurating a new era. Many indications, which it would take too much space here to consider in detail, suggest that Caesar himself and the intellectual circles at Rome (chiefly devoted to the cause of the Republic) had in mind the complex of ideas associated with the crisis in the affairs of men to be expected at such a juncture. Certainly Augustus, if not Caesar, became the center of Messianic hopes with all the embellishment of legend inevitable under the circumstances, as Deonna has well shown. So great was the disagreement of the calendar with real time that the adjustment had to be made piecemeal, allowing a last year of great confusion. Even then Caesar did not venture to indicate when the final readjustment should be made, which would of course come with the first intercalation under the new calendar. Why he did not do so must remain a matter of conjecture: it may have been want of precise astrological or astronomical knowledge, or it may have been policy dictated by considerations connected with the beginning of the new Aeon. Our sources seem to have taken a very matter of fact view of the question, saying that the intercalation should take place after four years; but this merely reflects the ordinary practice, once the final

adjustment was made.<sup>2</sup> At all events Caesar wisely left the determination to the pontifices: he did not live to see the correction made, which accordingly occurred at the close of the year 41 B. C., ostensibly to avoid the coincidence of January 1, 40 B. C. with a market day (Dio Cassius, 48. 33). The very day, therefore, on which Pollio began his consulship and Vergil expected the new Aeon with its attendant blessings, was the one for which, supposedly, the final correction of the Julian era was effected.

One might cite much evidence from various sources in support of this explanation; but I will confine myself to a work with which Norden shows no acquaintance. Though it abounds in things of extraordinary interest, as will be seen by references in the sequel, it seems to be but superficially known even to the more serious students of ancient chronology. I refer to *The Chronology of Ancient Nations* of Al-Biruni, translated by Sachau (London, 1879). Its author, a Persian adherent of Islam, wrote about the year 1000 of our era, and had a very precise knowledge of many matters of the greatest importance touching the calendar and calendar festivals. In particular he shows an acquaintance with the astrological tradition still vital in his time among the peoples who longest retained their ancient devotion to the subject. Hence his book contains many valuable hints for the student, who will be able to gather the same information elsewhere only by the most careful study and inference.

Zoroaster, as all men know, was reputed the founder of a new religion and of a new era. Now, a new religion naturally marks an epoch, which will as naturally be dated at New Year. Thus Al-Biruni says (p. 200): "One Persian scholar adduces as reason why this day (the Persian New Year) was called Naurôz, the following: *viz.* that the Sabians arose during the reign of Tahmurath. When, then, Jamshid succeeded, he renovated the religion, and his work, the date of which was Naurôz, was called *New Day*. Then it was made a feast day, having

<sup>2</sup> In fact, this does not apply, because the Julian calendar was put into effect on March 1, 45 B. C.; moreover, the regular intercalation was no doubt intended to be made, as before, not in December, but in February.

already before been held in great veneration." This was of course long before Zoroaster. Regarding the latter Al-Biruni says (p. 17): "The Persians and Magians think that the duration of the world is 12,000 years . . . and that Zoroaster, the founder of their law, thought that of these there had passed till the time of his appearance, 3000 years, *intercalated with the day-quarters; for he himself had made their computations, and had taken into account that defect, which had accrued to them on account of the day-quarters, till the time when they were intercalated and were made to agree with real time.*<sup>3</sup> From his appearance [an Epiphany?] till the beginning of the Aera Alexandri they count 258 years; therefore they count from the beginning of the world till Alexander 3258 years. However,<sup>4</sup> if we compute the years from the creation of Gayômarth, whom they count to be the first man, and sum up the years of the reign of each of his successors—for the rule (of Iran) remained with his descendants without interruption—this number is, for the time till Alexander, the sum total of 3354 years. So the specification of the single items of the addition does not agree with the sum total." One sees here the chronologist's effort to fix with absolute precision the beginning of an era in terms of whole years, corrected by intercalation to agree with real time. What Al-Biruni elsewhere (pp. 32, 86) tells us about the era of Alexander is equally interesting; for the Jews, he says, reckoned this data as precisely 1000 years "corrected" (by intercalation) after Moses, i. e. after the exodus.

To the Moslem, of course, the era of the Hejira was of supreme importance. How definitely that was determined by the chronologists may readily be seen by consulting the hand-books, —e. g., Ginzel, 1, pp. 258 sq., though our authorities hardly realize the true nature of the available data. Here, however, we are concerned with a special point and must ignore other questions, which would too much complicate the argument, and return to Al-Biruni. Speaking of the earlier irregular use of

<sup>3</sup> The italics are mine. P. 55 he says: "When Zoroaster arose and intercalated the years with the months, which up to that time had summed up from the day-quarters, time returned to its original condition."

<sup>4</sup> This is Al-Biruni's criticism of the Persian tradition.

intercalation on the part of the Arabs before Islam he says (p. 74) : "This went on till the time when the Prophet fled from Makka to Madîna, when the turn of intercalation, as we have mentioned, had come to Sha'bân [the 8th month]. Now this month was called Muharram [the 1st month], and Ramadan [the 9th month] was called Safar [the 2d month]. Then the Prophet waited till the "*farewell pilgrimage*,"<sup>5</sup> on which occasion he addressed the people and said: 'The season, the time has gone round as it was on the day of God's creating the heavens and the earth' (*Sura* ix. 38). By which he meant that the months had returned to their original places, and that they had been freed from what the Arabs [before Islam] used to do with them. Therefore, the "*farewell pilgrimage*" was also called "*the correct pilgrimage*." Thereupon intercalation was prohibited and altogether neglected." Regarded as a statement of historical fact this is demonstrably untrue; for the era of the *Hejira* was not fixed until some time after Mohammed's death: indeed even the statements of Mohammedan authorities that this was done by Omar in the 17th year after the Flight is subject to grave doubt, though it is at present generally accepted. But Al-Biruni's report is of the greatest significance as revealing the complex of conceptions connected with the determination of a new era, particularly one depending on a renewed world under the guidance of a new religion. The clock shows the very time, to a day, of the creation, but it requires correction by intercalation. Since in Islam Mohammed is regarded as "the seal of the

<sup>5</sup> This is a transparent fiction. The purpose of connecting Mohammed's Flight with the annual pilgrimage is merely to refer it to the beginning of the year; for the Arabs' *hajj*, like the Hebrews' *hag*, was of course a New Year's festival. The process is precisely like that of the Hebrew account of the exodus or hasty flight of the Israelites from Egypt. As the exodus began on New Year's day at the Egyptian Passover, and ended with Joshua's passover of the Jordan, accomplished "on the tenth day of the first month" (*Joshua* 4. 19), so Mohammed began his Flight at the New Year *hajj* and completed it when the Jews of Medinah were observing the Day of Atonement (the 10th *Tishri*, the 1st month of the so-called civil year). The correspondence even to the day and hour can be traced in the Mohammedan tradition, which is a most elaborate construct hardly to be attributed to the simple Arabs of Omar's day.

prophets," with none to come after him, there will be no new era; consequently henceforth intercalation is prohibited and among Mohammedans, who employ a pure lunar year, is altogether neglected. Among Christians, who expect a second advent, it is not so; hence a Christian poet may sing

"For lo! the days are hastening on  
By prophet-bards foretold,  
When with the ever-circling years  
Comes round the age of gold."

The Gospels contain few hints of such beliefs among the Christians of the first generations, but the Fathers, chiefly those of the East, were steeped in them; and from them the tradition flows which even yet echoes in the Christmas carols.

We seem, then, to have discovered the reasons which led Vergil to expect that the wheel of time would begin a new revolution on January 1, 40 B. C.; but we have not been able to reconstruct the Sibylline oracle which he cites, except so far as the context of his poem may be assumed to have had its counterpart therein. In a matter of this sort, however, it is idle to speculate; for, even if the oracle merely foretold that when such and such conditions, which obtained in the beginning, were repeated, the critical time would be at hand, Vergil, knowing from other sources the expected course of events, could supply them without regard to the Sibyl. Any one who is at all familiar with the thought of that time knows that of such sources there was great abundance. With this knowledge we must, at least for the present, content ourselves.

A series of very interesting questions, however, connects itself with the precise time of the world's expected renewal. Vergil's poem, as we have already remarked, was to be presented to Pollio upon his inauguration as consul on January 1, 40 B. C., the day when, with precise correction by intercalation, the year would start exactly "on time." Just where the intercalary day was inserted is not known, but one may venture the guess that it was a *bisextus*, interposed between December 26 and 27. Further grounds for this conjecture will presently suggest themselves to the reader, and need not be here set forth; let me content myself with calling attention to the *bisextus* in February, in use even before the Julian reform of the calendar,

and still employed, chiefly as an unmeaning term, our manner of numbering days having changed. However that may be, the expected intercalation would of course be known to the people of Rome not later than the calends of December, when the announcement would be made by the pontifices. This would give ample time for the composition of the *Eclogue*, and may with reasonable probability be assumed as its *terminus post quem*.

A larger and more important question relates to the precise time when the Aeon and the divine child should, according to expectation, be born. Norden, as we have seen, dates the reign of Helios-Apollo from December 25 and the birth of the Aeon and of the child on January 6. Regarding these dates he has given some valuable information, but especially from the latter date he draws unwarranted conclusions, because he is too little acquainted with ancient calendars. He infers that the entire tradition regarding the Aeon derives from Egypt, where he has indeed found significant data. The matters of which I now proceed to speak have occupied my thought for ten years and are the subject of an extensive study now nearly completed. I can here give but a few of the results of my researches, the publication of which in detail I have neither the desire nor the right to anticipate, but it appears desirable to say enough to warn hasty readers of Norden's book against accepting his far-reaching conclusions.

Of December 25, it is not necessary to speak at length, because the numerous studies in recent times devoted to the antecedents of Christmas have already furnished sufficient data,<sup>6</sup> and Norden does not attempt to connect this date with Egypt; but it is otherwise with January 6, to which therefore I will chiefly direct attention. Now both these dates are of course New Year's days: so much must be apparent to everyone who has at all

<sup>6</sup> One interesting datum seems to have been generally overlooked. Al-Biruni, p. 316, speaking of the Sabians, says: "According to Abu-alfarag Alzanjani they celebrate on the 24th of this month [Hilal Kanum I = December] the feast of the Nativity." He also says (p. 318) that their year began with the winter solstice. Since, according to his report, their religion was, like that of the Samaritans, a mixture of the Jewish and the Magians', it is probable that by the Nativity is meant the *natalis Solis*.

considered the question, and speaking specifically of January 6, at Alexandria, this has been already recognized by Boll and Weinreich. If one regards this fact by itself it may appear to be merely a curious datum, explicable solely as incident to the transfer of dates from one calendar to another; but a wider survey will show that it is not so, and that the grounds on which it is specifically referred to Egypt require to be carefully reconsidered.

From what has been already said it must be clear that among the peoples who entertained such hopes and fears the New Year epoch was fraught with the most solemn associations. Indeed, one might almost write the history of the religions of those peoples who dwelt in the Eastern Mediterranean Basin by tracing the development of the rites and thoughts connected with their New Year festivals,—if only the indispensable prerequisite, the evidence for dating the documents, were not unfortunately wanting. Nevertheless, though a *vera historia* cannot be reconstructed, the evidence quite suffices to prove a far-reaching agreement both in the rites and in the thoughts which they suggested to the adherents of the several important religions. The few illustrations which follow, taken from the large number which might be cited, may serve to indicate what a comprehensive survey would show.

To begin with the Jews: though they divided their sacred history into a larger number of eras, two stood out most prominently as they considered the past,—the era of creation, and the era of Moses or of the exodus; when they considered the future, in their eschatology, their redemption and the coming of Messiah occupied their thoughts. Consequently these points of time, the beginning of the human race or the beginning of their religious and national history, on the one hand, and on the other the end of all things, framed their thoughts regarding the whence and whither of man. Creation, of course, was "in the beginning," and beginning and end coincided. Let me quote from the Talmudic tract on the New Year:<sup>7</sup> "Rabbi Eliezer says: 'In Tishri the world was created . . . in Nisan our ancestors were redeemed from Egypt, and in Tishri we shall again

<sup>7</sup> *Rosh ha-Shanah*, p. 16 tr. Rodkinson.

be redeemed.' Rabbi Joshua says: 'In Nisan the world was created . . . On New Year's day the bondage of our fathers in Egypt ceased. In Nisan our ancestors were redeemed from Egypt, and in the same month we shall again be redeemed.'<sup>7</sup> The apparent difference of opinion between the Rabbis is immaterial, because the Jews had two epochs of the year, in Nisan and Tishri respectively; whence either might be taken as the beginning. In these months fell their chief festivals: Passover in Nisan; New Year's day, the Day of Atonement, and the Feast of Tabernacles in Tishri. Moreover, both 'Nisan' and 'Tishri' were interpreted as meaning 'beginning.' Alongside this pronouncement of the Rabbis place the grandiose recital of the Passover ritual in which all the wonderful works of God in the past are referred to the Passover in Egypt, and the promises of redemption are referred to the Passover to come. Now all these points of time are really New Year's days.

This calls for a brief explanation, though it is impossible here to do more than state dogmatically the conclusions reached after long study. New Year's day (*Rosh ha-Shanah*), falling on Tishri 1, is admittedly of postexilic origin. The Day of Atonement, on Tishri 10, is the beginning of the Jubilee Year, and its character as a New Year's day has never been lost to the consciousness of the Jews. Why two such days should succeed one another after an interval of nine days, no one can now say, though various conjectures have been offered to explain the fact.<sup>8</sup> All that we know is that during the exile the Jewish calendar fell, or had fallen, nine days behind the Babylonian; for *Ezekiel* (40. 1) tells us that New Year fell on the 10th of the (Babylonian) month. Now, both the Feast of Tabernacles and Passover, which are beyond question New Year's festivals antedating the exile, are dated on the 15th days respectively of Tishri and Nisan: it is obvious, for reasons which will presently suggest themselves as we consider the New Year's festivals of neighboring peoples, that these dates were fixed, during or after

<sup>8</sup> To me the most probable explanation seems the neglect of intercalation. In all scientific matters the Hebrews were backward. They borrowed their calendar, and with it their festivals; but when cut off from intercourse with their more advanced neighbors, they would succeed as little as the Arabs in regulating their calendar.

the exile, with reference to the reconstructed Jewish calendar disclosed by the statement of Ezekiel, for both these festivals begin on sixth days. In this, again, they agree with creation, which lasted six days, man being created on the sixth. Here, then, we have a parallel, if not for the birth of the Aeon, at least for the birth of the child, on the sixth day of the official year; for there can be no doubt that the *hexaemeron* of creation is modelled upon the six-day term of the New Year festivals. In the biblical account this fact is obscured by the revamping of the text in conformity with the later Jewish practice of holding festivals for seven days.

Al-Biruni says (p. 115): "However, those *origines mundi*, i. e. Adam and Eve, have been used as the epoch of an era. And some people maintain that *time* consists of cycles, at the end of which all created things perish,<sup>9</sup> whilst they grow at the beginning; that each such cycle has a special Adam and Eve of its own, and that the chronology of this cycle depends on them." Again (p. 116): "Other people maintain that in each cycle a special Adam and Eve exist for each country in particular, and that hence the difference of human structure, nature, and language is to be derived." P. 55: "The Persians believe that the beginning of their year was fixed by the creation of the first man, and that this took place on the day Hurmuz of Farwardin Mâh [i. e. on Farvardin 1, 1st month], whilst the sun stood in the point of the vernal equinox in the middle of heaven. This occurred at the beginning of the seventh millennium,<sup>10</sup> according to their view of the millennia of the world. The astrologers hold similar opinions, *viz.* that Cancer is the horoscope of the world." The Persians, however, were not content

<sup>9</sup> The New Year's festivals of the Persians were Naurôz and Mihrajân. Al-Biruni says (p. 208): "Alkisrâwi relates:—'I heard the Maubadh of Almutawakkil say: On the day of Mihrajân the sun rises in Hâmin in the midst between light and darkness. Then the souls die within the bodies; therefore the Persians called this day Mihragân.'" As Hâmin appears to be an intermediate place between heaven and hell, there may be a connection between this and the Descent to Hell as well as Purgatory. Further reasons might be cited for this conjecture, but limits of space forbid going into them here. Al-Biruni (p. 219) mentions the belief that man's spirits leave their bodies at full moon. This is the time of the Jewish pilgrimages.

with a single New Year's day. Not only the 1st, but also the 6th Farvardin was Naurôz (New Year's day), the former characterized as the "Little," the latter as the "Great." Of the latter Al-Biruni says (p. 201): "On the 6th Farvardin, the day Khurdâsh, is the Great Naurôz, for the Persians a feast of great importance. On this day, they say, God finished the creation, for it is the last of the six days, mentioned before. On this God created Saturn, therefore its most lucky hours are those of Saturn.<sup>10</sup> On the same day, they say, the *Sors Zarathustrae* came to hold communion with God, and Khaikhusrau ascended into the air. On this day the happy lots are distributed among the people of the earth. Therefore the Persians call it 'the day of hope.' " We have thus two New Year's days succeeding one another after an interval of five days. The same is true of Mihrajân, the corresponding festival falling in the seventh month; the precise days on which it began and ended are differently reported and need not detain us here. We shall presently see that Mihrajân also had its associations with creation; but before we speak of these things attention should be called to another group of festivals observed among the Persians. At somewhat irregular intervals, apparently determined by the agricultural seasons, were held six festivals known as Gahanbars, each held for terms of six days, to which the several works of creation were assigned. The sixth and last Gahanbar seems, at least originally, to have coincided with the five Gatha (or epagomenal) days *plus* (the Little Naurôz or) New Year's day. Hence in this scheme also creation is completed on a sixth day, which is, however, New Year's day; for the Persian calendar provides a vague year of 365 days composed of twelve months of 30 days each *plus* the five epagomenal days, or epact. Hence, reckoning from the close of the year proper,—*i. e.* of the 12th month,—New Year's day is the sixth. Spiegel and Darmstetter, remarking the close parallel which this elaborate scheme presents to the biblical account of creation, concluded that the Avesta was in this respect influenced by Jewish ideas. This judgment is utterly unsound, as will presently appear from a

<sup>10</sup> For the connection of Saturn with the sixth and New Year's days, see below, p. 232.

comparison of the festival arrangements of other peoples; but even if these Iranian scholars could be pardoned for their ignorance of these other things, they ought at least to have known the facts relating to Iran. For Al-Biruni tells us (pp. 56, 57) that both the Sogdians and the Chorasmians commenced their years with the Great Naurôz, *i. e.* Farvardin 6. How deeply this scheme entered into Iranian chronology may be seen by another datum given by Al-Biruni (p. 205): "The 6th day [of Khurdâdh-Mâh, the 3d Persian month], or Khurdâdh-Rôz, is a feast Khurdâdhagân, so called on account of the identity of the name of the month and the day. The meaning of the name is the stability of the creation." Perhaps some Arabist will inform us whether we should not say "cessation" instead of "stability" here; but in any case, it is interesting to see creation once more brought into relation with a sixth day. Such things are not crudely borrowed from a people as far removed as the Jews.

It will now be of interest to note some of the associations of these Persian New Year's days, once more quoting Al-Biruni. P. 208: "On the same day [Mihrajân], they say, God spread out the earth and created the bodies as mansions for the souls. In a certain hour of this day the sphere Ifranjawî breathes for the purpose of rearing the bodies.<sup>11</sup> On the same day God is said to have clad the moon in her splendor and to have illumined her with her light. . . ." <sup>12</sup> "The Persian theologians have derived various symbolic interpretations from these days. So they consider Mihrajân as a sign of resurrection and the end of the world, because at Mihrajân that which grows reaches its perfection and has no more material for further growth, and because animals cease from sexual intercourse.<sup>13</sup> In the same way

<sup>11</sup> Above, p. 221, n. 9, we met the notion that the souls die within the bodies at Mihrajân. Taken in conjunction with this, it is obvious that this New Year festival had for the Persians suggestions not only of the end of the world and its re-creation but also of a personal death and resurrection.

<sup>12</sup> Whether this refers to new moon or to some other phase is not quite clear to me.

<sup>13</sup> Aside from its reference to the seasons of the year there may be here a connection with the Babylonian *Descent of Ishtar*.

they make Naurôz a sign for the beginning of the world, because the contrary of all these things happens on Naurôz." This distribution among two festivals of acts which alike belong to the New Year should occasion no surprise. P. 99: "Persian scholars say that in the day of Naurôz there is an hour in which the sphere of Fêrôz is driven on by the spirits for the purpose of renovating the creation." That this undetermined hour was the sixth will presently appear probable.

While students of Jewish eschatology have discovered many points of agreement between it and the thought of the Persians, and a few significant ones between it and the Egyptian, little has hitherto been discovered regarding Babylonian eschatology. Yet there is at least one point of interest that should be brought out. In the Babylonian *Epic of Creation* Marduk on the occasion of his enthronement destroys and again restores a garment by the word of his mouth (*Tab. iv*, 29 sq.). This clearly symbolizes the destruction and re-creation of the world. Now, for our present purpose, it is of importance that in Babylonian thought creation is inextricably interwoven with the observances of the two New Year festivals which fall, like the Jewish and the Persian, respectively in the first and seventh months. Furthermore we are now, through the recent publication of the texts,<sup>14</sup> placed in the fortunate position of being able to make out the scheme of these festivals. It would require more space than I may properly claim to set forth the evidence at present, and I must therefore content myself with stating the result of my analysis. The festivals seem to have corresponded exactly, occupying the period from the first to the eleventh of their respective months: the first five days are preliminary, the festival reaching its height in the latter part, which begins on the night between the fifth and sixth, and extends to the eleventh. During this period Nebo of Borsippa pays his annual visit to his father, Marduk, at Babylon. We may therefore be sure that the first and sixth are the high days, the New Year's days *par excellence*, among the Babylonians, as among the Persians. Among the

<sup>14</sup> H. Zimmern, in *Verh. der Sächs. Gesells. der Wiss., Philol-Hist. Kl.*, vol. 58 (1906), Heft 3, and *ibid. vol. 70* (1918), Heft 5; F. Thureau-Dangin, *Rituels Accadiens*, 1921.

latter the presence of the Gatha-days enables us to see that both these high days are sixth days. If we reckon the eleventh at Babylon a high day, as we probably should, it too is a sixth day. Since creation and the renovation of the world are so closely connected with the New Year's festival, we may be sure that they were significantly associated with sixth days. This is the more probable because it is well known that the number six was especially sacred among the Babylonians, and that terms of five days (erroneously called "weeks") frequently occur in the cultus of Marduk. It is the more noteworthy, therefore, that—so far as I know—there is no evidence of a five-day epact in the Babylonian calendar, though Kugler long ago produced the proof that for commercial purposes there existed a year of 360 days, thirty days to a month. Since the value of 365 days for the year was early known to the Babylonians, one may speak of a *constructive epact*, which was, however, obscured by the practice of occasionally or periodically intercalating a whole month.

In Egypt the calendar is very ancient. From the time of the first dynasty onward it retained essentially the same form, the vague year of 365 days, consisting of 12 months of 30 days *plus a* five-day epact, the epagomenae being reckoned now with the preceding, now with the following year. As the *dies natales* of the five Osiride divinities, born "neither in month nor in year," they were a solemn season having a ritual of their own. Since overlapping festivals, beginning in one month and concluded on the first day of the following, were common in Egypt, we may be sure that the solemnities of the turn of the year included New Year's day, the more as the first day of every month was a festival in honor of the whole pantheon, especially of the Osiride gods. Here, then, we have what might be regarded as the typical form of the New Year festival, New Year's day falling on the sixth day after the close of the year properly so called. When we add to this the evidence, adduced by Norden after others, of the birth of Aeon and Osiris on Tybi 6, we have once more the reduplication of New Year after an interval of five days. Parenthetically one may here refer to the repeated Passovers mentioned in the Hebrew tradition.

No doubt some will be inclined to say, that this showing argues strongly in favor of Norden's hypothesis that this entire

scheme, of which to be sure he betrays very little knowledge, is derived from Egypt. But this conclusion is not warranted either by our knowledge of the historical relations between the countries in question or by reasonable reflection on the character of the observances. Moreover, there is very disconcerting evidence of similar schemes observed by other peoples whom it would be folly in the present state of our knowledge to suppose dependent on Egypt. In Greece, New Year's festivals, recognized as such, are conspicuously absent; but sixth days, generally with the same associations as the New Year's days we have been considering, play a considerable rôle. This fact might be explained by the hypothesis of borrowing from Anatolia, where, if space were granted, it could be shown that the same forms largely prevailed. It will be admitted that the probability of Anatolian and Hellenic borrowing from Egypt is very slight. That the *bissexturnus*, inserted after the Terminalia even in the pre-Julian Roman calendar, makes of the last five days of February a virtual epact, is at once obvious. Parenthetically I may remark that the recognition of this fact settles the question, erroneously answered by Mommsen, as to the place of the *bissexturnus*: it fell of course between the Terminalia and the epact. Whence this arrangement of the Roman calendar was derived is an unsolved mystery: Egypt seems not a likely place of origin, though Julius Caesar doubtless derived help from Egypt. In Greece, so far as I know, there is no calendar epact. Even more difficult to connect with Egypt is the practice of the Druids reported by Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* 16. 250. Speaking of the mistletoe found on the oak he says: "Est autem id rarum admodum inuentu et repertum magna religione petitur et ante omnia sexta luna, quae principia mensum annorumque his facit et saeculi post tricesimum annum, quia iam uirium abunde habeat nec sit sui dimidia." After noting these negative instances it may seem superfluity of naughtiness to refer to the existence of a five-day epact in the calendars of the Mayas and Aztecs with the expectation that the end of the world may come on New Year's day at the expiry of a term of fifty-two years. If I were asked where this scheme originated, my answer must be that I do not know, and that at present no one can say any more than that. The contemplation of the facts adduced, which might be indefinitely multi-

plied, should be a wholesome lesson to those who, upon a few isolated data, hazard a pronouncement on the subject of origins. One gains nothing by substituting Egypt for the *fons et origo* proclaimed by the Panbabylonians.

Though we may never know whence these ideas spread, it is a fact easily demonstrated that they prevailed practically everywhere in the Eastern Mediterranean Basin. The sixth day,—the day of Epiphany, of the Nativity,<sup>15</sup> of the creation of man, of the birth of the Aeon, of the Crucifixion, of the Transfiguration, of Passover, of Tabernacles, of Jum'ah, the Mohammedan day of assembly,—possessed solemn associations, which are but faintly reflected in the modern superstitions about Friday. If one follows the clews which a knowledge of this fact affords, one may prove the connection of great groups of data which have hitherto remained unrelated, or have been compared on the ground of a general resemblance only that might be the result of the merest chance. A few illustrations will presently be given. Meanwhile it may be well to point out that the sort of equation just made between various sixth days is not, as it might seem, purely fanciful, but quite in the manner of men to whom such things were sacred. Though little understood in the West, except by Tertullian, Jerome, Ambrose and Augustine, all of whom had intimate connections with the East, the Greek Fathers revelled in them, despite the biblical depreciation of the practice of observing days and seasons. To most of them the connection of these ideas with New Year's observances had become obscure, if indeed the confusion of calendars had not quite effaced it. Here and there, however, it is still quite plain to us. Thus Ginzel (iii. 179) says: "Der 25. März galt bei vielen Komputisten als wichtiger Tag, da er als Datum der Geburt Jesu, der Weltschöpfung, aber auch als Tag des Todes Jesu und Tag der Auferstehung angenommen wurde." This is quite in the manner of good Bishop Victorinus of Petau (*De fabrica mundi, Patr. Lat.*, 5, 313): "Ea die natum esse

<sup>15</sup> The Nativity was first dated at Epiphany (Jan. 6); but when it was removed to Christmas the Eastern Church retained the same scheme, appointing Dec. 20 the *proëortia*, thus making Christmas a sixth day.

Christum, qua hominem finxit, eadem die esse passum, quo Adam cecidit." If one wishes a perfect example, let him consult Clem. Alex., *Strom.* 6. 16, p. 812 P., where Jesus, on the mount of Transfiguration ("after six days," and observed on August 6), is called "the fourth" (being accompanied by Peter, James, and John) and "the sixth" (by the addition of Moses and Elias),—thereby, perhaps, accounting for the Christian "stations" on the *feria quarta* and *feria sexta*,—and finally, proclaimed by the Voice, the seventh, becomes "the eighth," in obvious allusion to the Lord's day as the eighth. In this connection he mentions the hexad as declaring His birth. One may refer also to the fact that in the genealogy of *Matthew*, 1. 17, Jesus likewise appears as the sixth, at least as the passage is interpreted by Clement (*Strom.* 1. 21, p. 411 P.). A most significant passage occurs in Augustine, *De diversis quaest.* 44 (*Patr. Lat.*, 40, 54 sq.), where Jesus is said to have come in the sixth age of man, on the sixth day, at the sixth hour, citing the fact (*John* 4. 6) that the Saviour appeared to the Samaritan woman at Jacob's well "at the sixth hour." This would be quite unintelligible to us, if we did not have other means of knowing why this was said: it is of course obvious that the Saviour was somehow connected with the number six, but Augustine himself hardly gives us the necessary clew. This is happily provided by other texts. Christian eschatology, agreeing with that of the Jews, except in holding that the Messiah has already come, looks forward to the second advent at the end of the times. Every student of eschatology is aware that the scheme of the last days agrees with that of the pilgrimage festivals, though he may not be aware of the reason for this agreement. Reference was made above to the liturgy of the Jewish Passover and the association of the events expected at the end of the 'Olam or Aeon with the "Passover to come." Thus we understand the words of Jerome, *In Matth.* xxv. 6: "Traditio Judaeorum est Christum media nocte uenturum in similitudine Aegyptii temporis, quando Pascha celebratum est et exterminator uenit et Dominus super tabernacula transiit." The Ambrosian hymn "Mediae noctis tempus est" connects the midnight Passover with the midnight coming of the Bridegroom (*Matth.* 25. 6), and one must not forget that the *Gospel of Nicodemus* and the Greek Church give

midnight as the hour of the Resurrection. Since midnight, like midday, is the sixth hour, the hour of the Crucifixion, one sees how important it is. Christian tradition in turn sets the hour of the Nativity at midnight on December 24 to 25 or January 5 to 6—in other words at the very moment of the transition from the fifth to the sixth day. One recalls that Passover also is dated the 14th or 15th Nisan, the hour being the line of demarcation between the days. That this is to be connected with the passage from the last day of the epact to New Year's day should be obvious.<sup>16</sup> Syrian Christians differ regarding the date of the Nativity, some assigning it to Friday, while the majority say it was Thursday, as the Mohammedans question whether the Prophet began his Flight on a Thursday or a Friday, though most take the former view. One recalls also the so-called "anticipated" Passover of Maundy Thursday, when the Lord's Last Supper was held. Though Egypt may have no elaborate eschatology, it follows the same scheme. In lieu of the Last Judgment at the end of the world the Egyptian believed in a judgment undergone by each decedent when he mounted the bark of Ra and took the voyage through the twelve stations of the night: the judgment took place when the dead reached the judgment seat of Osiris, set up in the sixth region. The judgment therefore falls at the sixth hour—midnight. One might pursue this subject much farther, but let this suffice.

Let me now show by several examples how groups of data, which have hitherto been either unrelated or precariously connected solely on the ground of a certain superficial resemblance, can be proved to stand in a very close relation, once the scheme has been recognized. In his *Schöpfung und Chaos* Gunkel pointed out that the myth of Rahab, the dragon, is associated alike with creation and the end of the 'Olam; and, recognizing the kinship of this myth with that of Tiamat, who is slain by Marduk, he

<sup>16</sup> Chabas, *Le calendrier des jours fastes et néfastes*, p. 210, says of the fifth day of the Egyptian epact: "Nom de ce jour: 'Le jeune qui est dans son nid est son nom'." . . . "Le même nom propre, pour le cinquième des épagomènes, est mentionné dans les inscriptions du temple de Dendérah (Dümichen, *Bauurkunden*, Taf. 18, l. 17). Le jeune dieu, qui est Osiris ressuscité, prend naissance dans la nuit du dernier jour de l'année."

insisted on the Babylonian origin of this motif. Whatever one may think of his conclusion, there can be no doubt that there is a connection between the Hebrew and the Babylonian myths; for the latter forms a part of the story of creation which is associated with the New Year festival. Similar myths exist in India, but I have no means of establishing a direct connection between them and either the Hebrew or the Babylonian, though it is not improbable, because the Hindu and the Iranian present so close a parallel that they can hardly be divorced. As for the Iranian myths of this character their connection with creation is made obvious by the Avesta, while Al-Biruni establishes their connection with the New Year festivals. Thus he says (p. 209): "On the 21st, or Râm-Rôz, is the *Great Mihrajân* in commemoration of Frêdûn's [Feridun's] subduing and binding Al-Dah-hâk [Satan]. . . . Thereupon he put him in fetters and imprisoned him in the mountain Dubâwand. Thereby people were freed from his wickedness, and they celebrated this event as a feast. Frêdûn ordered them to gird<sup>17</sup> themselves with *Kustiks*, . . . as a tribute of thanks to God for having again made them their own masters<sup>18</sup> with regard to their whole behavior and to the times of their eating and drinking, after they had been living in fear so long as 1000 years. This has come down as a rule and custom on the day of *Mihrajân*." Elsewhere (p. 202) the similar story of Jam [Jamshid] and his expedition against 'Iblîs is brought into relation with Naurôz, and again (p. 220) the difference in regard to the New Year epochs in use in Sogdiana and Persia is explained by saying that the Sogdiana "preferred to use as New Year that moment when Jam returned successful [from his attack on 'Iblîs], whilst the [Persian] kings preferred as New Year that moment when Jam started." Here the exodus and the nostos are divorced, as above we saw creation and the end of the world distributed between the two New Year festivals. Each festival properly had both an exodus and a

<sup>17</sup> As the Hebrews girded their loins at Passover; Jesus girded himself with a towel at the Last Supper (*John* 13. 4-5). The Persian festival, like Passover and the Lord's Supper was essentially a commemorative repast.

<sup>18</sup> As the Hebrews were delivered from bondage to the Egyptians. To the Jews this is the type of salvation.

nostos.<sup>19</sup> The exploit of Feridun against Dahhak furnishes a suggestive commentary on the myth of the passion and triumph of Marduk at the vernal New Year festival,<sup>20</sup> which has latterly attracted so much attention. Superficially less similar but certainly parallel to it are the Egyptian myths of the conflict between Horus and Set and between Ptah (or Ra) and Apophis. This is shown by an inscription of the time of Amenhotep III., in which the king in uttering a threat says, "They shall become like the snake of Hell Apophis on the morning of the New Year; they shall be overwhelmed in the great flood."<sup>21</sup> In the Egyptian myth Set is not slain, but released upon terms;<sup>22</sup> to this we have, apparently, a Persian parallel in the statement of Al-Biruni (p. 208): "Alérânhâhrî says: God has made a treaty between Light and Darkness on Naurôz and Mihrajân"; for that all these myths are at least in some aspects solar hardly admits of question. Of course, on reading this Egyptian inscription one thinks inevitably of the apocalyptic vision of the end of the world (*Rev. 20. 1 sq.*): "And I saw an angel coming down out of heaven, having the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, the old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut it, and sealed it over him, that he should deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years should be finished: after this he must be loosed for a little time." From what has been already said we should be able to guess that Satan was, or was to be, bound at the beginning of the Aeon, in this case the millennium; Au-

<sup>19</sup> This might be illustrated by many examples, as by the Hebrew exodus, which was one pilgrimage, framed at the beginning by the departure from Egypt and at the end by the "return" to Canaan. An equally good illustration may be found by comparing what Al-Biruni says (p. 207 sq.) about the first, or Little, Mihrajân with the statement above quoted in part about the Great Mihrajân, in regard to Feridun.

<sup>20</sup> Transcription and translation by H. Zimmern, "Zum babyl. Neujahrsfest, Zweiter Beitrag," in *Ber. über die Verh. der Sächs. G. der Wiss.*, Leipzig, vol. 70 (1918), p. 2 sq.

<sup>21</sup> Brugsch-Bey, *Hist. of Egypt*, 1, p. 434.

<sup>22</sup> Plutarch, *De Isid. et Osir.* 40. Horus, whom Tertullian calls the Valentinian Aeon, overcomes Set *χρόνῳ*, 'in course of time.'

gustine *De civ. Dei*, 20. 6-8 makes it all plain by dating the event on the sixth day. Satan would of course be freed after a thousand years to a day, "for a little time," as the fettered Kronos, likewise sent to the under-world, was bound and then released at the Saturnalia (Macrob., *Sat.* 1. 8. 5). That the Saturnalia were connected with the turn of the year,—indeed, that they constituted an interlude or *interregnum*<sup>23</sup> like the epact, requires no argument. A study of the rites of Kronos-Saturn shows clearly his connection with the sixth day, but I cannot here give the evidence.<sup>24</sup> The battles of the Olympian gods against the Giants and Titans duplicate one another: Kronos is the king of the Titans (Apollon. Rhod. *Arg.* 1. 507), and doubtless of the Giants. On the Hill of Kronos at Olympia the Basilae offered a sacrifice to Kronos at the vernal equinox, because he there wrestled with Zeus (Pausan. 8. 2, 2). The occasion was doubtless that of the battle of the Giants, from which Kronos came to this hill, thus giving it its name (Pseudo-Plut., *De fluviis*, 19. 3). On what day this battle was decided we learn from another source (Leutsch, *Paroemiographi*, 1. 401): ἐκτη ἡμέρᾳ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἡμερῶν ἐν ταύτῃ γὰρ μνθεύεται τὸν θεοὺς νενικηέναι τὸν γίγαντας. Lydus, *De mens.* 4. 3, p. 66, 18 sq. W., says that the Roman *ovatio*, held on Jan. 1, celebrated the victory of Zeus over the Giants. How widely this feeling prevailed in Greece might be shown by a study of the days on which the great battles of Greek history were commemorated. For want of space to point this out in detail, let me refer the student to Aelian, *V. H.*, 2. 25.

I will give one more illustration of the way in which observances thus reveal their essential connection. Norden says (p. 35) that January 6 (Nativity-Epiphany) was adopted into the Christian festival calendar from the mysteries of Dionysus-Osiris, basing his conclusions on the<sup>25</sup> concurrence (noted by Holl) on this date of the birth of Osiris at the time of the cere-

<sup>23</sup> It is known that the *interregnum* at Rome was always for a term of five days, the term, in case of need, being repeated *ad libitum*.

<sup>24</sup> See above, p. 222, for the birth of Saturn at Naurōz. That Saturn is the god of Time is stated by the Fathers. The Babylonians call the planet Saturn "the star of Helios."

<sup>25</sup> Cp. above, n. 16.

mony of drawing water, which formed part of the festival of the Pamylia, with the festival of Dionysus on Andros, at which a spring was supposed to flow having a taste of wine. That there is a connection between these festivals need not be called in question; but, again, a wider survey of the available evidence will hardly serve to confirm the inference drawn from the few facts cited. That Norden should not have known at least a part of this other evidence is less surprising than that his theologian friends should be ignorant of it. The *Gospel of John* (7. 37), reporting the words of Jesus spoken at the Feast of Tabernacles, which have long been recognized as referring at more than one point to the observances of that New Year's festival, says that on that day Jesus stood and cried, "If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water," and adds, "But this spake he of the Spirit, which they that believe on him were to receive." Theologians long ago saw in these words an allusion to the rite of drawing water at Tabernacles from the pool of Siloam. This pool, however, was ancient, though we do not know how early the rite was practised there. Libations of water were of ancient use at Hebrew fasts (*i. Sam.* 7. 6; *ii. Sam.* 26. 16). The Mishnah (*Succah*, c. 4) says that at Tabernacles a pitcher of gold was carried to the altar filled with water from Siloam; there it was poured into a basin on the West, while wine was poured into one at the East. Both basins were perforated, so that the liquid might flow out; but the Talmud does not disclose whither the libations flowed, though one surmises that the water was conducted to the West, the wine to the East.<sup>26</sup> The wine-offering seems to be of later origin, though the date of its introduction (probably from the daily offering, which came apparently after *Ezekiel*) cannot be determined. The prophets abound in allusions to similar rites, though they do not mention the wine. Thus *Zechariah* (14. 7 sq.), referring to the great and terrible last day, says: "It shall be one day which is known to Jehovah; not day, and not night; but it shall come to pass that at evening time there shall be

<sup>26</sup> Among the Jews, as with the Greeks, the East belongs to God and the good, the West to Satan and the evil. Wine is not offered to the dead, or the gods of the dead, who receive water (wineless) libations.

light.<sup>27</sup> And it shall come to pass on that day that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the eastern sea, and half of them toward the western sea." Here one is fairly compelled to think that the prophet had in mind a festival like Tabernacles. The living waters are those of a spring, and are divided, as were all the *sacra* of the Hebrew religion. It must be recalled that the Jews connected the incident of Meribah also with the Feast of Tabernacles and its rite of drawing water. To this Paul (*i. Cor.* 10. 4) alludes when he says: "They drank of the spiritual rock that followed them: and that rock was Christ." The Hebrew tradition, especially in the *hallel* sung at the opening of the pilgrimage festivals, frequently refers to God as the Rock of Israel, and Christian hymnology retains the figure in reference to Christ as the Rock of Ages cleft for sinners. The rite of drawing water at Tabernacles was the most ecstatic of all, being celebrated with dances, in which even the sages participated with lighted tapers (*Sukkah*, 4). The interpretation of Jesus' words as said in reference to the Spirit is made intelligible by the fact that the Talmud speaks of the *sukkah*, the booth of Tabernacles, as "the house of the drawing of water," because the Holy Spirit was drawn from it.<sup>28</sup> If we took the requisite space, it might readily be shown that the incident of Meribah reflects a Passover, which would yield another link connecting the rite of drawing water with the New Year. We need not then look to Egypt and the rites of (a Greek) Dionysus or an Egyptian Osiris for this rite or for its association with the sixth or New Year's day. These were ancient folk-customs, which are not readily transferred from land to land. The only thing that remains to be explained is the wine libation, for which, so far as I know, there is no reason to look to Egypt: nor is the rite of Andros eligible as a possible source. On the other hand a suggestion at least of a rite akin alike to that of Andros and the Jewish Tabernacles is contained in the incident of the miracle of Jesus at the marriage feast at

<sup>27</sup> Presumably said in allusion to the illumination which was a marked feature of many festivals: whence the name Φῶτα given to Hanukkah, a replica of Tabernacles, celebrated Kislev (December) 25, and to Epiphany.

<sup>28</sup> References in Jewish Encycl., xi, 661<sup>b</sup>.

Cana. Here, as Professor Bacon pointed out,<sup>29</sup> there is in the Gospel story indicated a term of six days; and this miracle, the first recorded of the Master, is commemorated at Epiphany. In Jewish tradition there is a hint that the incident at Meribah underwent the same transformation as the rite of Siloam. In *Numbers* 20. 11 it is reported that Moses smote the rock twice and water came forth abundantly; but the *Targum of Palestine* (on *Num.* c. xx, p. 406 Etheridge) says that when Moses smote the rock "at the first time it dropt blood, but at the second time there came forth a multitude of waters." One recalls that Moses smote the river (Nile) with his rod and converted it into blood. Possibly there is here an intelligible symbolism; for the Hebrews were quite familiar with the notion that wine was "the blood of the grape" (*Gen.* 49. 11; *Deut.* 32. 14; *Sirach* 39. 26, 50. 15). Christians, from Paul onward, saw in the rock of Meribah a type of Christ, whose blood is drunk in the wine of the eucharist: hence it was doubtless regarded as especially significant that when His side was struck and pierced at the Crucifixion by the soldier's spear, "straightway there came out blood and water" (*John* 19. 34; cf. *Baruch* 4. 15). The mention of the Nile in the miracle of Moses must not, however, mislead us into seeking the source of the rite and its associations in Egypt; for, excepting the wine, rites not unlike that of Siloam are abundantly attested in Persia, especially at New Year festivals which, as we have seen, fall on sixth days. Here we may again avail ourselves of data furnished by Al-Biruni. He relates several stories to explain the rites of sprinkling or washing with water on Naurôz, New Year's day. The first (p. 199) tells how a swallow met Solomon carrying water in its beak, which it sprinkled before the king; other versions may be quoted at length (p. 202 sq.). "He (Jamshid) ordered people to wash themselves with water in order to cleanse themselves of their sins, and to do so every year that God might keep them aloof from the calamities of the year. Some people maintain that Jam ordered channels to be dug, and that the water was led into them on this day. Therefore people rejoiced at their prosperity, and washed themselves in the water that was sent<sup>30</sup> them

<sup>29</sup> "After Six Days," *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, viii (1915), 94 sq.

<sup>30</sup> "Siloam" also is "sent" water.

(by the channels), and in this respect the later generations have considered it a good omen to imitate the former ones. Others, again, maintain that he who let the water into the channels was Zû, after Afrâsiâb had ruined all the dwellings of Erânshahr. According to another view, the cause of the washing is this—that this day is sacred to Harûdhâ, the angel of the water, who stands in relation to the water.<sup>31</sup> Therefore people rose on this day early, at the rising of dawn, and went to the water of the aqueducts and wells. Frequently, too, they drew running water in a vase, and poured it over themselves, considering this a good omen and a means to keep off hurt. On the same day people sprinkle water over each other, of which the cause is said to be the same as that of the washing. According to another report, the reason was this—that during a long time the rain was withheld from Erânshahr, but that they got copious rain when Jamshid, having ascended the throne,<sup>32</sup> brought them the good news of which we have spoken [that he had overcome Al-Dahhak]. Therefore they considered the rain a good omen, and poured it over each other, which has remained among them as a custom. According to another explanation this water-sprinkling simply holds the place of purification, by which people cleansed their bodies from the smoke of the fire and from the dirt connected with attending to the fires. Besides it serves the purpose of removing from the air that corruption which produces epidemic and other diseases." Again (p. 206), similar practices are reported as in vogue Tîr-Mâh 13 at the feast Tiragân, and (p. 215) Bahman-Mâh 30 at Ispahan. Though it cannot be proved, it is not unlikely that both occasions are old New Year festivals. In the latter passage occurs the motif of "hardening the heart" (which clearly belongs to the fast) familiar to us from the biblical references to the desert pilgrimage and particularly the incident of Meribah. Finally one may refer to the well-known

<sup>31</sup> One is reminded of the incident of the pool of Bethesda (*John* 5, 1 sq.), which occurred at a feast of the Jews. Some have identified this as Pentecost; but that is unlikely, because it occurred on a sabbath, and Pentecost would be dated on the morrow after the sabbath. Passover and Tabernacles were commonly regarded as Sabbaths in the days of Jesus: it is therefore more likely to have been Tabernacles.

<sup>32</sup> The enthronement of the king or god is another New Year theme.

custom of blessing the waters of the Jordan at Epiphany. A glance at the Persian traditions reported by Al-Biruni will convince one that the custom of drawing water at New Year must have been very ancient and is not at all likely to have been derived from Egypt, say, during the period of the Persian rule in that land. It will likewise show that the practice was closely akin to that of the Jews both at Tabernacles and on the Day of Atonement.

There are many questions inevitably raised by the data which have been here brought together and the much larger number of essentially the same character which might be adduced. Some may no doubt be capable of solution, and on another occasion I may be tempted to offer suggestions to that end; but this discussion has already run to a length beyond what was contemplated, and I must close. I trust I have sufficiently shown that Professor Norden's attempt to refer to Egypt the entire tradition of the Aeon and the divine child expected at its inception fails for want of a general survey of the available data.

W. A. HEIDEL.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY.

## II.—PHILOLOGICAL AND ARCHEOLOGICAL STUDIES.<sup>1</sup>

### 1. Camel and Cable.

Jesus says (Mark 10, 25; cf. Matt. 19, 24; Luke 18, 25): *It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to enter the kingdom of God.* A camel going through a needle's eye is a proverbial saying like the Lat. *cum mula peperit*, or the Fr. *croire voir les étoiles en plein midi*, or the Ger. *das Gras wachsen hören* (for ὀξύκοον ἀναβαίνειν) which is derived from a passage in the Younger Edda (Simrock 1, 27) where this faculty is ascribed to Heimdall. *Needle's eye* cannot denote a small door in the panel of the city gate (Rodwell's *Koran*<sup>2</sup> 319<sup>4</sup>; Penrice's dictionary 72<sup>5</sup>). The small panel-door is not called *needle's eye*, and no camel, even if stripped of its load, could be forced through it, because it is only from 3 to 4 feet high, and 1½ to 2 feet wide (DB 1, 345<sup>b</sup>).<sup>2</sup> The Arabic name of this small opening is not *samm-al-xiijāt*, eye of a needle (Hommel, *Säugetiere* 145<sup>4</sup>) but *xáyxah* = Eth. *xôxt*, door (GB<sup>16</sup> 217<sup>b</sup>; NBSS 151). In the Talmud (BT 6, 601, l. 16) we read that the people of *Pûmbêdîtâ* deemed themselves so clever that they could put an elephant through a needle's eye (*méaijélin pilâ bě-qûpâ da-měháttâ*). Aram. *pilâ*, of course, is not the Lat. *pilum*, Fr. *fil*, but denotes *elephant*, Ass. *pîru* (JBL 40, 171). Cf. also Matt. 23, 24 (*strain out the gnat and swallow the camel*). Nor can we assume (RB 830; RE<sup>3</sup> 21, 747<sup>6</sup>) that Jesus used the Aramaic word *níqbâ*, hole (JHUC 163, 62<sup>b</sup>) which may denote not only *eye of a needle* (Syr. *máqqébâ* < *mangabâ*; Delitzsch's Heb. NT has *näqb-ham-mahhât*) but also *tunnel* (Arab. *naqb*, *mánqab*). With the addition *da-měháttâ*, of a needle, there could be no ambiguity.

Some later MSS read in Mark 10, 25 and the two parallel

<sup>1</sup> The following eight brief communications are abstracts of papers presented at the monthly meetings of the Johns Hopkins University Philological Association during the academic session 1923/4 on Oct. 18, Nov. 15, Dec. 20, Jan. 17, Feb. 21, Mar. 20, Apr. 10, and May 15, respectively.

<sup>2</sup> For the abbreviations see vol. 43 of this JOURNAL, p. 238, n. 2.

passages *κάμιλος*, cable, instead of *κάμηλος*, camel. This reading is followed in the Armenian version (5th cent.) and is mentioned by Cyril of Alexandria (who died in 444). Also in the Koranic passage (7, 38): *Those who deem our signs frauds . . . will not enter Paradise till a camel pass through a needle's eye* there is a variant *júmmal*, rope, instead of *jámal*, camel. *Κάμιλος* does not occur in Greek literature; it is mentioned, however, by Suidas (c. 970) and in the Aristophanic scholia in connection with a passage (1030) in *The Wasps*. It is the prototype of our *cable* which is generally derived from the late Lat. *capulum* (or *caplum*) a halter for catching or fastening cattle (<*capere*). But a cable is not a lasso or lariat. Nor can it be connected with *catabola*, a kind of *ballista* for hurling stones, which was put in motion by ropes. Some modern Greek dictionaries have *κάμιλος*, cable; but the common expression is *palamári* or *kálos* (*κάλως*). The Arabic lexicographers state that *júmmal* (or *júmal*, *juml*, *júmul*, *jumâlah*) is called also *qals*. While Arab. *qals* <*κάλως* (which is connected with *κλώθειν*, to spin) *κάμηλος* and *κάμιλος* are Semitic loanwords.

In the 15th or 16th centuries we often find the form *gable* instead of *cable*. We have it also in the enlarged edition of Hakluyt's *Voyages*, published c. 1600 (*they had neither oars, masts, sails, gables*) and (c. 1614) in Chapman's *Odyssey*. The oldest form is *gabula* (recorded in 1193). The *g* is due to partial assimilation: in Semitic, surds often become sonants under the influence of *l*, *r*, *m*, *n*.<sup>3</sup> The names Tiglath-pileser and Sargon have a *k* in Assyrian. On the other hand, Arab. *kuhl*, kohl (>*alcohol*; OLZ 17, 53, n. 2) appears in Assyrian as *guxlu*. Ass. *udru*, Bactrian camel (Arab. *jámalu*'-s-*sanâ-máini*) <*utru*<sup>4</sup> < Pers. *uštra*, camel, which we have in the name of Zoroaster, *Zarathushtra* > mod. Pers. *Zardúsh*. Ass. *udru* represents a dialectic form *hutra* (there is no *h* in Assyrian) <*šutra* (mod. Pers. *šutúr* or *uštúr*).<sup>5</sup> Heb. *gořít*, sulphur, is

<sup>3</sup> See JAOS 43, 121<sup>m</sup>. 424, 1. 10. 425<sup>m</sup>; cf. Brugmann's *Grundriss*<sup>1</sup> 1, § 568, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Arab. *fádara*, to be exhausted (orig. *broken* = weakened) <*fá-tara mina*'-*l-dirâbi* <*fárra* (Ass. *purruru*).

<sup>5</sup> Contrast 'Av. *udra*, otter; Lat. *lutra*, Sp. *nutria*, Gr. *ἐννδόπλις*; cf. La-garde, *Beiträge zur bactrischen Lexikographie* (1868) p. 70.

the Aram. *kibrît* < *kiprît* (BL 128). Arab. *rijâm*, pl. of *rújmah*, < *rikâm* = *rakâm*, heap (JBL 40, 171<sup>m</sup>). Our guitar (cf. *gittern*) < κιθάρα > *cithara*, *cithern*, *cittern*, *cither*, *zithern*, *zither*, *citole*. The old name of Gallipoli was Καλλίπολις. According to Pliny (3, 120) the Adriatic was originally called *Atriacum*. In modern Greek, *nt* becomes *nd*, and *mp*: *mb*; ἀντί appears as *andí*; Lat. *antenna*, sail-yard (which may be a corruption of ἀντεταμένος) is *andéna*; ἀμπελών, vineyard: *ambelónas*; It. *endivia* (< Lat. *intibum*, *intubum* > ἔντυβον and Arab. *híndab*) is therefore spelled ἀντίδια. According to Ember, *g* in Hebrew names containing a media or liquida (e. g. *Gibea*, *Gibeon*, *Gilgal*, *Megiddo*) is written *k* in Egyptian, because *k* in such cases was pronounced *g* (cf. Nöldeke, *Syr. Gr.*<sup>2</sup> § 22, n. 1, and Babyl. *Kâbâra* = OP *Gaúbaruua*, *Gobryas*).<sup>6</sup> We pronounce *Israel*, *crimson*, *Windsor*, *asthma* with *z* instead of *s*.

The *g* in Heb. *gamál*, camel, is later than the *k* in κάμηλος (*Est.* 57). *Gamál*, camel < \**kamal*, humped. Arab. *júblah* < \**kumlah* means *hump* of a camel. Ass. *gungupu*, hump (ZA 34, 197) < *gubgubu* is derived from the same root as is also the common Arabic term for mountain: *jábal*. Arab. *sanâm*, hump of a camel (which may be connected with *samânah*, fatness) denotes also *hill*. The highest mountain in the Odenwald, between the Neckar and the Main, is called *Katzenbuckel*. Our *buckler*, shield, is derived from *bocla*, boss of a shield, which is called in German: *Buckel*, and *boss* was formerly used for *humpback* (Ger. *Buckel*; cf. Fr. *la bosse du chameau*) while modern geologists apply this term to an irregular knob-like outcrop of eruptive rock, especially of granite, e. g. *a number of prominent crags and bosses projecting beyond the general surface of the ground* (CD 634<sup>c</sup>t). Κάμηλος is originally a feminine collective (cf. Herod. 1, 80) < Arab. *jimâl* or (with *imâlah*; AJP 8, 280) *jimêl* (so e. g. in Jerusalem). We have this ē also in Fr. *chamelle*, while the masc. *chameau* represents an original *kamal*. In MHG the name was *kemel*, *kemmel*, or *kembel*. In Zurich there is a house *Zum Kämbel*. The *hump* of a camel is an accumulation of fat, and a *cable* is an accumulation of strands, while *gum* (Lat. *gummi* < *cummi* = κομμι = Heb. *al-*

<sup>6</sup> There are no signs for *o* in the Assyrian script (ASKT 166, § 10; AJP 8, 287, n. 2).

*gummîm*; JEA 7, 83<sup>i</sup>) which is derived from the same root (*cf.* κάγκαρον = *cancamum*, Plin. 12, 98 < Arab. *kamkâm*, i. e. the gum-resin which is called in Hebrew: *qōrî*) is an accumulation of latex. Heb. *gam*, also, means orig. *accumulation*; Ger. *auch* is connected with *auξάνειν, augere*.<sup>7</sup>

The explanations of *gamal*, camel, as *retaliative* (μητσίκακος) or *handsome*, or *full-grown*, or *massy*, *bulky*, or *beast of burden*, are untenable. While *asinus*, ass, is a Sumerian loanword (OLZ 18, 361, l. 14) *camel* is Semitic (Hommel, *Säugetiere* 144<sup>t</sup>; contrast SFG 70<sup>m</sup>) < *km*, to heap > Arab. *kûmah* and *kûmzah*, heap; *âkamah*, heap of stones, elevation, hill; *kamm*, mass; Ass. *nakâmu*, to amass, heap up (*Isaiah* 119, 15). Arab. *kaumâ'u* (syn. *sânimah*) is a *she-camel with a large hump*. We have this root also in Arab. *tâmaka* (< *takama*) which means (the hump of the camel) *was high and fat*. In several Hebrew words (e. g. *gib'â*, hill) the root *km* appears as *gb*; *cf.* also Ass. *gabbu* (ZA 24, 151) and *nagbu* (ZA 30, 225<sup>s</sup>) *totality* = Arab. *jam'*, and Arab. *najm*, star < *nâjama*, to rise. For Ass. *gab'âni*, heights, and *gubbâni*, cisterns, see the paper on *σιρός*, silo, and *σωρός*, stack, in JBL 40, 171. As to the interchange of *b* and *m*, we find in the Koran (3, 90; *cf.* WdG 2, 228, l. 1) *Bâkkah* for Mecca (JAOS 43, 425, l. 9). Ass. *gammalu*, camel, is an Arabic loanword (BA 1, 171).

## 2. Salted with Fire.

In the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. 5, 13) Jesus says to His followers: *Ye are the salt of the earth*, i. e. *Ye keep the earth sweet*, preventing corruption and decomposition. Ass. *tâbtu*, salt, is the feminine of *tâbu*, good, which means orig. *sweet*, so that *tâbtu*, salt, signifies prop. *sweetener*, i. e. *keeping things sweet*, preventing putrescence and rancidity which would make them offensive, *i. e.* ill-smelling. Just as Ass. *tâbu*, good, means orig. *sweet-scented*, so the primary connotation of Ass. *bîšu*, evil, is *ill-smelling* (*cf.* Ex. 5, 21 and our *unsavory*). The strong-smelling goats symbolize evil (JAOS 42, 376<sup>i</sup>). Ass. *tâbtu*

<sup>7</sup> Ger. *auch* is originally imperative (*add!*) like Ass. *ezib*, save (*cf.* Lat. *salvo eo quod* and Fr. *sauf*) = except, not including, in addition to, besides (contrast Zimmern, *Ištar-Saltu* 32<sup>i</sup>; see also OLZ 25, 405<sup>m</sup>).

means both *salt* and *benefit*. We can say *It is very sweet of you* instead of *It is very good of you*. Ass. *ṭûbu* = *ṭuijubu* (JBL 39, 153, l. 10) to make, build = Syr. *ṭajjîb*, to prepare, means orig. to do well (JAOS 44, 168, l. 11). In Arab. *ṭâma-iaṭîmu*, to fashion, form, do well, we have *m* for *b*. In Aram. *ṭibbâ*, rumor (orig. *ṭêbâ*) < Ass. *ṭêmu* (= *ṭa'mu*) on the other hand (JAOS 32, 18) we find *b* for *m* (AJP 8, 269). Ass. *ṭêmu* was afterwards pronounced *ṭîu* (AJP 8, 266; 39, 307). Heb. *ṭît*, clay (Ass. *ṭîtu*) < *ṭîn-tu* < *ṭîm-tu*; cf. Heb. *ἰοçέρ*, *πηλοπλάθος*, *figulus* < *iaçář*, *πλάττειν*, *figere* (cf. Verg. *Aen.* 2, 80 and the Plautine *factor fortunae* or *vitae agendae*). Lat. *figere* (> *figtile*, *figura*, *effigies*) is connected with *τεῖχος*, *τοῖχος*, Av. *pairidaēza* (= *περίτειχος*) > *παράδεισος*, and Ger. *Teig* (cf. BL 129). Our *dough* was used also for *potter's clay*. Ger. *Ton*, clay (Goth. *thâhô* < *than-hô*) seems to be a Semitic loanword.<sup>8</sup>

Herodotus' statement (1, 198; cf. PAPS 61, 232<sup>m</sup>) that the Babylonians put dead bodies in honey may be due to a misunderstanding of the term *ṭâbtu*, sweetener, *i. e.* salt (contrast Tallqvist, *Maqlû* 163<sup>b</sup>) just as the rainbow in the Biblical story of the Flood seems to be based on the misreading of the ideogram for *muscaria* or *flabella* in l. 164 of the cuneiform account of the Deluge (KAT<sup>2</sup> 558<sup>t</sup>. 517<sup>s</sup>; JAOS 41, 181<sup>t</sup>). Pliny (31, 98) calls salt *defuncta etiam a putrescendi tabe vindicans ut durent ita per saecula* (cf. Streck, *Assurb.* 404, *ad* 61). It is true, Pliny (22, 108) states also: *mellis quidem ipsius natura talis est ut putrescere corpora non sinat*.

In the appendix (contrast Wellhausen, *Ev. Marci*<sup>2</sup> 77, l. 10) Mark 9, 49. 50 (after the secondary quotation from Is. 66, 24; cf. JHFUC 306, 13<sup>t</sup>; JBL 38, 46) *salted with fire* (*πυρὶ ἀλισθήσεται*, *igne salietur*) does not mean *salted and smoked* (Lat. *sale et fumo indurati*). Nor can it be rendered *purified with fire* (salt does not purify) or *made acceptable to God*, because, according to the addition in Lev. 2, 13, all offerings had to be offered with salt. J. D. Michaelis (1790) said: man is *salted for the fire*, just as the sacrifices were salted (Joseph.

<sup>8</sup> For Ger. *Ton* (pronounced *tone*) < Arab. *ṭîn* see BA 1, 252, l. 1; *Est.* 7, l. 12; cf. also Syr. *mêtôm*, ever < Ass. *matî-ma*, whenever, while Syr. *immât(i)* when < Ass. *immatî-ma* < *ina-matî-ma* (AJSL 22, 251; JAOS 43, 425).

*Ant.* 9, 3, 1). The meaning of this *crux interpretum* is *seasoned* (and hardened) *in the fire* of affliction. A modern writer might have used *stealed*, i. e. *made firm*, as hard as steel. Shakespeare uses *to season* for *to keep sweet*, fresh, preserve from decay. At the beginning of *Twelfth Night*, Valentine says to the Duke that Olivia will walk veiled like a cloistress,

all this to season  
A brother's dead love, which she would keep fresh  
And lasting in her sad remembrance.

Schlegel renders this: *balsamieren*, embalm (*cf.* Arab. *fájjaba* = *hánnája*).

Timber is seasoned by drying and hardening it. A *salted* ship is a ship filled with salt between the timbers and the planks for the preservation of the wood. Posts that are to be fixed in the ground have their buried ends charred (*cf.* *praeustae sudes*; *stipites praeacuti et praeusti*, *Caes. B. G.* 5, 40; 7, 73). Strabo (168. 771) says that the inhabitants of the Balearic Islands charred the points of their wooden javelins, and that the Ethiopians of Endera (near Meroë) charred the heads of their arrows (*cf.* *ZA* 35, 151, 3: *era ša ina appi u-išdi išâta kabbu*). Odysseus charred the point of the pole of olive wood, cut from the Cyclopean club, which he plunged into the eye of Polyphe-mus (*Od.* 9, 328). The insides of barrels are often charred: American whiskies used to be stored in heavily charred barrels; the cleansing and purifying effect of the charcoal, formed by the burning of the cask, helped to mature the liquor (*EB*<sup>11</sup> 28, 593). We may also refer to the *ferrum candens* of the ancient surgeons (*cf.* *καίειν*, *Xen. An.* 5, 8, 18; *Mem.* 1, 2, 54, > *καυτήριον*, searing-iron).

Wood is often treated with creosote which smells like smoked meat. Creosote may be obtained from pyroligneous acid (*ace-tum pyroligneum crudum*) which may be used also for the preservation of meat (*Ger. Schnellräucherung*). Export tobacco, cured over slow open wood fires, kindled on the floor of the barn, which impart to it a creosotic flavor, is called *fire-cured*. In South Africa a horse which is immune from endemic horse-sickness by reason of a previous attack is termed a *salted* horse. We call a person experienced in some occupation: *salted*.

In *Mark* 9, 49 *salted* signifies *strong to endure hardship*. A

severe test is called a *fire ordeal* or *crucial test* (< *crucible*, not < *crux*). In OT a great trial is often referred to as a *furnace* for smelting ore, especially iron. Egypt is called the *iron-furnace* of Israel. But Mark 9, 49 does not allude to the purifying and refining of metal, although we have this figure in Mal. 3, 3 (JHUC 316, 28). *Salted with fire* means *seasoned by trials*, hardened by afflictions.

### 3. Mercury in Roman Medicine.

It is generally supposed that the special medicinal properties of mercury were not fully appreciated before the middle of the 16<sup>th</sup> century, and the extensive internal use of mercurial preparations is said to have been introduced by the founder of the Vienna school of medicine, Gerard van Swieten (1700-1772) who was Maria Theresa's physician and director of the imperial library. His son, who succeeded his father as Principal Librarian, was a friend of Haydn and Mozart; he furnished the text for Haydn's oratorios *The Creation* (1799) and *The Seasons* (1802). The Arabian physicians are said to have used mercury only for skin diseases, and mercury as a therapeutic agent is supposed to have been unknown to the Greeks and Romans.

But the Romans used minium, which according to Propertius (2, 3, 11) was a Hispanic word, not for red oxid of lead, but for native cinnabar, *i. e.* red sulphid of mercury, and Pliny (33, 116) says that, unfortunately, it is used by physicians, although it is poisonous: *at, Hercules, medici quia cinnabarim* (JBL 34, 72<sup>4</sup>) *vocant, utuntur hoc minio, quod venenum esse paulo mox docebimus.* In 33, 124 he says, he considers the medicinal use of the poisonous minium very risky; it should certainly not be used internally: *quod cum venenum esse conveniat, omnia quae de minio in medicinae usu traduntur temeraria arbitror.*

Pliny disliked medical men, although there were some good physicians in Rome during the last century of the Republic, *e. g.* Cicero's friend, the Bithynian Asclepiades who eschewed powerful remedies and relied on diet, exercise, massage, and cold baths. Even during the 19<sup>th</sup> century there was a strong prejudice against the use of mercury; some considered the remedy worse than the disease against which it was administered.

The Romans received cinnabar, the common ore of mercury,

almost exclusively from the quicksilver mines of Sisapo, the present Almaden (< Arab. *al-má'din*, the mine) N of Cordova, in the latitude of Lisbon. Pliny may have become familiar with the Spanish mines when he was procurator of *Hispania Tarraconensis* in 73 A. D. The crystals of cinnabar, which look like rubies, having a bright red color and adamantine lustre, are called by Pliny *chrysolites*, and he says the best are those which, when brought in contact with gold, make it white like silver: *optumae sunt quae in conlatione aurum albicare quadam argenti facie cogunt*. Cinnabar contains 87% of mercury.  $\mathfrak{G}$  uses *chrysolites* for the Biblical *stones of Tarshish*, and *Tarshish* appears in Latin as *Tartessus*. Plato's *Atlantis* represents the same region. The dawn of civilization in southwestern Spain may antedate the earliest monuments of Egypt and Babylonia. There may have been sea-traffic between Spain and Crete in the fourth pre-Christian millennium (JAOS 43, 126<sup>t</sup>. 163, b; contrast OLZ 26, 370<sup>t</sup>).

Mercury may have been used in Spain for medicinal purposes at that time. It is a mistake to suppose that the so-called *morbus Gallicus* is a comparatively recent disease, first observed about the end of the 15<sup>th</sup> century. The *treponema pallidum* is perhaps as old as mankind; it resembles the morbific agent of *framboësia* which is regarded in OT as a form of leprosy (JAOS 43, 163, c). The disease, with which the hero of the Babylonian Nimrod epic (ZDMG 64, 712, n. 2; OLZ 27, 57<sup>m</sup>; 26, 490<sup>t</sup>. 197) was stricken, because he rejected the love of the Babylonian Venus, seems to have been *lues venerea* (see the paper by J. K. Proksch in vol. 12 of Unna's dermatological journal, Hamburg, 1891).

#### 4. The Median Lapis-lazuli Mountain.

Tiglath-pileser IV as well as Sennacherib's father and son, Sargon and Esarhaddon, repeatedly mention a mountain in the remotest region of Media, at the edge of the salt-desert, *i. e.* the *Dasht-i-Kevir* of Khorasan. The name of this mountain is *Bikn*, and Esarhaddon (*cf.* Rost, *Tig.* 106<sup>t</sup>) calls it *šad uknî*, lapis-lazuli mountain. Ass. *uknû*, which has passed into Greek and Latin as *κύανος*, *cyanus* is evidently derived from *Bikn* which may represent an OP *Vikn* (or *Uikn*) just as Arrian has *Βυστάνης* for *Vištāna* which appears in Babylonian as *Uštāna* (JAOS 37,

314<sup>i</sup>). Similarly the name of the father of Darius I, Hystaspes, is in OP: *Vistâspa*, Babyl. *Uštâspa* (cf. Lith. *udra* = Pol. *wydra*, otter; see above, n. 5).

*Viknite* is a name like *malachite* < *Meluxa*, the Sumerian name of Nubia (JEA 7, 83). The cuneiform name for *malachite* (Sum. *guk*, Ass. *sându* = *šahamatu*, Heb. *šôh<sup>a</sup>m*) means prop. *black*, Arab. *ášamu*; myrtle and ivy are called in Latin: *niger* (cf. also Arab. *ádham* and *ṭiml*). Ass. *sându* was used not only for *malachite*, but also for *fluorite*, *jade*, *serpentine*, and other green ornamental stones (cf. Lat. *smaragdus*). Similarly Ass. *uknû* denoted not only *lapis lazuli*, but also *sapphire* and *turquoise*. The special name for *turquoise* is *uknû ebbu* (= Syr. *hēbīb*) or *banû* (= Eth. *bērūh*, Arab. *bâhir*; cf. JAOS 44, 168, l. 6) i. e. *light viknite*.

The Assyrians received their *lapis lazuli* from Badakshan (JHUC 114, 112) but Esarhaddon's *lapis-lazuli* mountain cannot have been the *Mazar-i-Ilakh* in Badakshan (BL 61) because the Assyrian king states that it was at the border of the salt-desert. Nor can it have been the Damavand, c. 50 m NE of Teheran, because there are no *lapis-lazuli* or *turquoise* mines in that region. We must therefore identify the Bikn with the peak *Ali Mirsai* on the southern slopes of which (at an elevation of 5100 feet, NW of the village of *Mâdan* = Arab. *má'dan*, mine, 32 m NW of the home of 'Omar Khayyâm, *Nishapur*) the famous *turquoise* mines are situated. We know that Esarhaddon invaded Egypt and Nubia, so we need not hesitate to assume that he advanced as far east as *Nishapur*, c. 500 m E of Teheran. In the reign of Esarhaddon (681-668) the Assyrian dominion extended from *Nishapur*, near the border of Afghanistan, to *Tarshish*, W of the Pillars of Hercules, which represents Plato's *Atlantis* (JAOS 43, 126. 163).

Esarhaddon calls the region of *Nishapur* *Patuš'arra* (= *Patuš<sup>u</sup>ra*; cf. ZA 2, 272; AJP 39, 307<sup>i</sup>; JAOS 43, 122<sup>s</sup>). He carried to Assyria two local chieftains, *Sitirparna*<sup>9</sup> and *Eparna*. Three other chieftains, *Uppis* of *Partakka*, *Sanasana*<sup>9</sup> of *Partukka*, and *Ramatea* of *Urakazabarna*, paid tribute in Nineveh. These Iranian names are 150 years older than the Achæmenian

<sup>9</sup> Ass. *š* was pronounced *s*, and *s:š* (JAOS 43, 126<sup>i</sup>; OLZ 27, 24<sup>m</sup>; JSOR 8, 52<sup>i</sup>).

inscriptions. We have also the names of 23 Median chiefs, with their capitals, who paid tribute to Esarhaddon's grandfather, Sargon, in 713 B. C. (VHKO 234; Delitzsch, *Kossäer* 48).

*Partukka* has been identified with *Paratocene* which is connected with Skt. *párvatas*, mountain, rock; but this name was given to a number of districts in Media.

*Patuš'arra* has been combined with *Πατεισχορεῖς* in which *ει* represents *i* (AJP 39, 309). In the trilingual inscription of Darius Hystaspis at *Naqš-i-Rustam* (two hours N of Persepolis) Darius' lance-bearer Gobryas (OP *Gaubarua*, Bab. *Kubarra*, i. e. *Gübâra* or *Gôbâra*)<sup>10</sup> is called a *Patischorian*. This name appears in the OP text as *Pâtišuvariš* (for *Pâtišxuâris*).<sup>11</sup> The *x* before *u* is elided. In modern Persian, on the other hand, the *u* in *xuâ* is not pronounced, while *xuâ* becomes *xo*, *xu*. Strabo's *Πατεισχορεῖς* shows that this pronunciation may have obtained at the beginning of the Christian era. The diphthong *au*, for which we find *â* in modern Persian, must have been pronounced *ô* in OP. Babyl. *Paiddišxuriš* shows that OP *pâti* was pronounced *paidi*, with epenthesis of the *i*, which we find in Avestan (JAOS 44, 158, d). The later form of this name is *Pâdišxuâr* which means *over against* or *in front of* *Khuâr* (the modern *Khâr*) i. e. the ancient *Choara* (or *Choarene*) which Pliny (6, 44) calls *Parthiae amoenissimus situs*. It was the region on the southern slopes of the Elburz range down to the salt-desert (ZA 12, 56). *Pâdi*, in front of,<sup>12</sup> may signify *east of*, just as Heb. *qidmât* has this meaning: *front* denotes *east*; *back*: *west*; *right*: *south*; *left*: *north*.

##### 5. Salvation and Redemption.

We call Christ our Savior and Redeemer. He is supposed to have suffered for our salvation, His passion being accepted as a substitute for the punishment which men deserved. The early Fathers held that Christ paid a ransom to Satan to induce him to release men from his power (EB<sup>11</sup> 2, 876<sup>a</sup>). According to the famous treatise *Cur Deus homo* by the founder of scholastic theology, St. Anselm, who died as archbishop of Canterbury in

<sup>10</sup> Cf. above, note 6.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Brugmann's *Grundriss*<sup>1</sup> 2, 264.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Lagarde, *Beitr. z.baktr. Lexikographie* (1868) p. 51.

1109, Christ's voluntary passion appeased God's justice demanding satisfaction for the sins which wounded His honor (EB<sup>11</sup> 2, 83<sup>a</sup>). One of the heretical theses of the *troubadour among the scholastics*, Héloïse's lover, Abelard, who died in 1142, was: *Quod Christus non assumpsit carnem ut nos a jugo diaboli liberaret*. St. Anselm was born in northwestern Italy, while Abelard, the boldest thinker of the 12<sup>th</sup> century, was a native of Brittany which was not incorporated with France before 1532. According to Abelard, Christ's passion arouses in us love which frees us from the bondage of sin, thus enabling us to fulfil the law and the will of God, not out of fear, but as children of God. The atonement is based on personal union with Christ (RE<sup>3</sup> 1, 25, ll. 3. 18). Similar views are held by modern Unitarian theologians who have accepted the results of the comparative study of religions. Practical religion is summed up in love to God, and love to man (EB<sup>11</sup> 27, 596).

The doctrine of vicarious atonement is based on the poem in Is. 52, 12-53, 13. In Matt. 8, 17 the line *Surely, he has borne our griefs and carried our sorrows* is taken to mean that Christ healed all that were sick, but the Hebrew original cannot have this meaning. Nor is the generally accepted interpretation correct that Christ endured the sufferings and pains which we deserved. *Our sufferings and our pains* means *the pains and sufferings we inflicted* on the Servant of the Lord, *i. e.* a collective term for the faithful Jews at the beginning of the Maccabean period (c. 170 B. C.).<sup>13</sup> The proselytes, *i. e.* the heathen converted to Judaism after the Maccabean victories, say: It was our fault that Judah was mangled, but the chastisement which Judas Maccabaeus and his successors inflicted on us had a salutary effect;<sup>14</sup> when they beat us we were cured: our eyes were opened, and we saw that Judaism was the only true religion, and JHVH the only true God (2 Mac. 7, 37).

This is the meaning of the hemistich *with his stripes we are healed*. The preceding hemistich, which appears in **G** as

<sup>13</sup> Cf. E. B. Pusey, *The Fifty-Third Chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters* (Oxford, 1877) pp. 37. 117. 275. 314. 564; also Lagarde, *Symmicta* 2, 13; contrast Gunkel, *Ein Vorläufer Jesu* (Bern, 1921) pp. 5. 18. 24; see also OLZ 25, 173; 27, 83.

<sup>14</sup> We must read: *u-mûsarô li-šlôménû 'alânu*.

ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν (*Ἐ* vulneratus est propter ini-  
quitates nostras) cannot mean: *He was wounded* (in vicarious  
suffering) *for our transgressions*; ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τοῦτο means  
*It was this man's fault that he was wounded*, just as we can say  
Διὰ τοῦτο τὰ πράγματα οὕτω κακῶς διάκειται, *It is this man's fault*  
*that the situation is so bad*. Ἐτραυματίσθη διὰ τούτον (*vulneratus*  
*est per eum*) would imply that this man wounded him with his  
own hand. *It is my fault* is in Hebrew: *bî hā-'aṣôn* (cf. 1  
S 25, 24) and in Arabic: *húya dámibî* or *وَدَ-دَامِبُو 'الْأَيْمَنَ*. In  
the same way we find in Latin: *mea culpa* or *meum vitium est*  
(JAOS 44, 157, b). If the theologians knew a little more  
Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, the development of Christianity  
might have been different. The existence of so many different  
denominations shows that the Bible is misinterpreted (JHUC  
163, 51<sup>bi</sup>).

The poem in Is. 52, 13-53, 9 consists of five pentastichs with  
3 + 3 beats in each line. The last two stanzas must be trans-  
posed. The following three verses (Is. 53, 10-12) contain nothing  
but a jumble of misplaced glosses. The Hebrew text, with  
translation and explanatory notes, will be published elsewhere.

#### 6. Threescore and ten.

The so-called *Prayer of Moses, the Man of God* (which may  
have been composed c. 100 B. C.) says:

Our years are threescore and ten, and, if one be strong, even fourscore;  
Yet most of them: labor and sorrow, for nought we are toiling and moiling.

We must read: *nîgá‘ hinnám uě-nî‘ápâ* (JBL 31, 122). In Ger-  
man you say of a septuagenarian: *Er hat das Alter des Psalm-  
isten* (or *das Psalmistenalter*) *erreicht*. A hundred years ago,  
when Goethe was 74 years old, he said (on Jan. 27, 1824) to  
his friend Eckermann (who, eight years later, became his  
literary executor): *Man hat mich immer als einen vom Glück  
besonders Begünstigten geprisesen . . . allein im Grunde ist es  
nichts als Mühe und Arbeit gewesen*. In the second part of  
*Faust* (8313) Proteus says: *Das Erdentreiben, wie's auch sei,  
ist immer doch nur Plackerei*. In Gustav Schwab's poem  
*Das Gewitter* the grandmother says: *Das Leben ist Sorg' und  
viel Arbeit*.

*Threescore and ten* is an English idiom; the Hebrew original of Ps. 90, 10 as well as the ancient versions have the common numeral for 70. All the early English Bibles preceding AV have *threescore and ten*, only the Wyclifite versions, which were made from **J**, use *seventy*, but the Wyclif Bible of 1388 has *threescore and ten* in Lev. 12, 5.

Score for a group of 20 (cf. Fr. *une vingtaine d'années* and *quatre-vingts* for *octante*) is recorded as early as 1100. The original meaning is *notch*: in counting sheep or cattle from 1 to 20 it was customary to make a notch on a stick before proceeding to count the next 20 (OD). In archery, *score* signified 20 yards; in Ireland and western England it denoted 20 lbs. In German, *Stein* is used in the same sense, whereas in England *stone* = 14 lbs. For 20 pieces you can say in German: *Steige* (or *Stiege*): in Hesse-Cassel you ask for *eine Steige Eier*, i. e. 20 eggs, but in Silesia you buy *eine Mandel Eier*, i. e. 15. Ger. *Schock* denotes 60 = 3 *Steigen* or 4 *Mandeln*. The original meaning is a *shock* of sheaves or grain. In New England these sheaves gathered in piles are called *stooks* which is connected with Ger. *Stauche*, bundle of flax. New England *stooks* generally consist of 12 sheaves. Ger. *Mandel*, which signifies also a *shock* of 15 sheaves, is a dialectic diminutive of *Mann*, man (contrast Grimm 6, 1535, l. 6). *Männchen machen*, said of a hare, means *to sit erect*; it is used also of a rearing horse. A *shock* of sheaves is called in German not only *Mandel*, but also *Puppe*, puppet. Luther has *Mandel* for AV *heap of corn* (Heb. 'ăremâ) in Ruth 3, 7 and for AV *shock* (Heb. *gadiš*) in Judg. 15, 5 (cf. also the mistranslations in Ez. 3, 5; Is. 17, 11; Hos. 12, 12). In Palestine the sheaves were not set up as shocks (DB 1, 50; EB 81).

*Shock* has originally the meaning of Ger. *Stoss* (e. g. *Holzstoss*, pile of wood) < *stossen*, to push, thrust (cf. Fr. *choquer*, *choc*) just as Ger. *Schober* (e. g. *Heuschober*, haycock) is connected with *schieben*, to shove > *sheaf* and *shovel*, Ger. *Schaufel*. Similarly *pile*, heap, must be combined with Lat. *pilum*, pestle, Ger. *Stössel*; cf. also *stack*, *stake*, *stick*, Ger. *Stock* (in *Heustock* = *Heuschober*, *Garbenstock*, &c.) and *Staken*, *stecken*, *stechen*. Also Ger. *Stauche* (see preceding paragraph) < *stauchen* = *stossen* (cf. *er stauchte sein Pferd in die Flanke*). Ger. *verstauchen* and its English equivalent *sprain* (< *exprimere*)

meant orig. *to press, push* (cf. Fr. *se fouler le bras* and *foule*, crowd, throng, multitude). Lat. *pilus*, maniple of the *triarii* (or *pilani*) means orig. *heap*, while Lat. *pilum*, javelin, is a spear thrown with a sudden *thrust* (cf. *hastam jacere, ἀφίέναι τὴν λόγχην*).

The Hebrews regarded an octogenarian as a dotard: the Gileadite Barzillai answered David, when the king invited him to follow him to Jerusalem (2 S 19, 36): I am this day four-score years old, and can I discern between good and evil? *i. e.* I am in my second childhood. Not to know good and evil (*i. e.* not to be capable of discerning between right and wrong) means *to be like a child* (cf. *Odyss.* 18, 228). The fall of man symbolizes the first sexual intercourse. Schopenhauer (*Parerga* 2, § 167) says: *Illico post coitum cachinnus auditur Diaboli*. He who eats of the forbidden fruit loses his childlike innocence, just as Adam and Eve perceived that they were naked (PAPS 50, 505; 60, 86; JHUC 316, 24). They were told by the Serpent (symbolizing concupiscence) that they would be like God, *i. e.* capable of producing human beings: they would become *under-makers* (CD 4581<sup>bm</sup>). After the birth of Cain, Eve exclaims: I have produced a man as well as JHVH (*Mic.* 63; *JBL* 36, 142).<sup>15</sup>

The average duration of life has increased with civilization, and this is chiefly due to temperance in eating and drinking. Fifty years ago a woman of 30 was regarded as *passée*, now *la femme de quarante ans* plays an important part in novelistic and dramatic literatures.<sup>16</sup> The Romans called a man over 60 *senex*.<sup>17</sup> A modern sexagenarian need not be senile.<sup>18</sup> The

<sup>15</sup> Dorothy Dix (Mrs. G. O. Gilmer) says: The woman who bears a child shares with God the great thrill of creation (Baltimore *Sun*, July 16, 1924, p. 6, col. 7).

<sup>16</sup> An advertisement in SEP, June 24, 1924, p. 139 states: In India a woman of 20 is aging, at 25 she is old. American women are now young at 40. Labor-saving devices, laundries, &c. have freed her from youth-destroying tasks. In seven years a washday a week mounts up to a year of washdays. American women are living youth when the women of India are remembering it.

<sup>17</sup> According to the laws of Ceos (Strabo 486) sexagenarians were to be *oslerized*: hemlock was to be administered to them.

<sup>18</sup> The Vice-President of the English Royal College of Surgeons, Sir

years 1-20 represent now spring; 20-45 (*ἡλικία, juventus*) : summer; 45-75 : fall; 75-90 : winter. A *lusty winter* is, to a certain extent, a personal merit. We must, of course, be careful in the selection of our parents, but a young giant may ruin his health for ever in a few minutes, while a delicate child may develop into an athlete.

#### 7. The Hittite Name of Troy.

Even after Schliemann's explorations at Hissarlik (1870-1873) many scholars doubted that the Homeric Troy ever existed. The keeper of the Ashmolean Museum in Oxford, D. G. Hogarth says at the end of his article on Schliemann (EB<sup>11</sup> 24, 341) that after Schliemann's death (1890) Dörpfeld's excavations at Hissarlik proved the identity of the sixth stratum with Homer's Troy, *if Troy ever was*. Now the editor of the cuneiform texts from the royal archives of the ancient Hittite capital at Boghazkeui (*c.* 100 m E of the new Turkish capital Angora which is *c.* 220 m by rail ESE of Constantinople) Dr. Emil Forrer, of Berlin, who has examined *c.* 11,000 clay tablets and fragments, has found (MDOG 63, 7) the Hittite name of Troy, written *Ta-ru-i-ša*, representing an ancient Gr. Τρωίσα which became, with elision of the intervocalic *s*, Τρωία, Τροία, just as the Eolic form of έως, dawn, αύως < αύσως which appears in Latin as *aurora* < *ausosa*. The *s* is preserved in our *East*, the region of dawn (*cf.* Juvenal 10, 1) and *Easter*, the dawn of the year.

These texts give also the name of Agamemnon's father who, according to the Hittite annals, must have reigned over Achaia (Hitt. *Axxiāuā* < *Axxaijuā*; *cf.* Lat. *Achivi*) *c.* 1225, while Troy is supposed to have been destroyed, after a ten year's siege by the confederated Achaeans under the lead of Agamemnon, in 1184. Dr. Forrer (OLZ 27, 118) thinks that 'Ατρεύς may not

D'Arcy Power, remarked in Baltimore (on April 16, 1924) that nowadays a man was no longer old at 70, and the average life of a human being would increase further. In the 16th century a man of 50 was considered an old man, and a man of 60 was thought to be exceptionally old. Many people died of apoplexy in the 19th century, while deaths from this cause to-day were comparatively few. The expectation of long life had greatly increased within the last few years (Baltimore Sun, April 17, 1924, p. 11, cols. 2. 3).

be Greek, but I believe this name is identical with the adjective ἀτρεύς, unshakable, intrepid. Hitt. *Attarissiias* (< *Attaristiās* < *Atristiās*) may represent ἀτρεστος. He is called a *ku-ri-e-ua-ni-eš* (also written *kuiryanas*) == *κοίπανος* (cf. *Il.* 2, 204). The Hittite renderings of Greek names and words are at least as accurate as the Talmudic *Ābîrûdêmôs* (or *Āyûdêmôs*, not *Uardîmôs*) < *Εὐρύδημος*, *Ātarbôlis* < *Τρίπολις*, *Aṭrâkânâ* < *Τράχων*, *āgîstôن* (or *āgîsté'ôn*, *āgîsté'ûn*) < *ἐκζητῶν*, *dēiôplôstôن* < *διπλόστων*, *dēiôpôsôpîn* (or *dēiôparçûpîn*) < *διπρόσωπος* (cf. *AJP* 39, 308, 1. 5).

The name of the citadel of Troy, *Πέργαμος*, is connected with *τύργος*, tower, Ger. *Burg*. The Turkish designation of the site of Troy is *Hissarlik*, fortification (< Arab. *hiṣār*, with abstract, not diminutive, suffix). *Τρωίσα* (> *Troia*) may be connected (contrast *Pauly*<sup>2</sup> 9, 1064, 49; 6, 730, 41) both with *τύρσις*, tower (which may denote a fortress like the Tower of London) and with *Τυρσηνοί*, the Greek name of the Etruscans whom the Romans called *Tusci* (> *Tuscany*). In Umbrian *Turskum nūmen* (= *Tuscum nomen*) the *r* is preserved. In the cuneiform script, *Troīsa* must be written either *Ta-ru-i-ša* or *It-ru-i-ša* which would explain *Etruria* (for *š* = *s* and *u* = *o* see above, nn. 9, 6).

Greek historians regarded Rome as a Tyrrhenian city, and Roman poets call the Tiber a Tuscan river. Many of the early Roman names are Etruscan.<sup>19</sup> Rome was ruled for some time by Etruscan kings. The ancestral hero of the Romans is the Trojan prince *Æneas*. The Roman patricians (cf. *JAOS* 42, 374<sup>i</sup>) were Etruscans, not Sabines, and the plebeians: Latins, but the Asiatic invaders adopted the language of Latium, just as the Hebrews (and the Phenicians who came from the *Ægean*) adopted the language of Canaan (*JHUC* 306, 22<sup>i</sup>).

The romance of *Æneas* and Dido (a surname of the tutelary deity of Carthage) reflects an ancient alliance between Etruria and Carthage, which was afterwards broken. The destruction of Troy was not due to the rape of Helen,<sup>20</sup> but to the rape of

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Wilhelm Schulze, *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen* (Berlin, 1904) p. 580 (Transactions of the Royal Society of Göttingen, vol. 5, part 2).

<sup>20</sup> The statement (published in a great many newspapers, e. g. *The*

Hellenes: Trojan piracy in the Dardanelles interfered with Greek commerce (cf. JAOS 34, 419<sup>i</sup>). The name *Dardanelles* is derived from *Æneas*' home *Dardanus* on the Hellespont, and Latin poets occasionally call the Romans *Dardani*. Πόντος in 'Ελλήσποντος means orig. *path*; cf. Lat. *pons* and *πόροι* ἀλός (*Od.* 12, 259). "Ελλη may be a name like Φουίκη, Θράκη, Κρήτη, and it may be connected with ἔλος, meadow-land (*Il.* 20, 221; cf. Strabo 328) just as the primary connotation of *Italia* (*Osc. Viteliu*) is pasture-land (EB<sup>11</sup> 15, 25<sup>b</sup>) < *vitulus*, calf, colt (= ἵταλός, prop. *yearling*; cf. ἔτος, JHUC 348, 49, Apr. 24). *Italia* denoted originally ancient Calabria (not modern Calabria, the *toe* of the boot) *i. e.* the *heel* (NE of the Gulf of Taranto) which ends in the Iapygian promontory (Cape Santa Maria di Leuca) c. 30 m SE of Otranto. Strabo (281<sup>e</sup>) calls this region εὐβοτος (cf. 228: ἀπασα ἡ Ἰταλία θρεμμάτων τε ἀρίστη τροφὸς καὶ καρπῶν ἔστιν. There are vast herds of cattle in Italy and enormous flocks of sheep. Pasture occupies about one-third of the total area of the country.

Hellas was originally the name of the home of Achilles, *Phthia* in southern Thessaly, N of the Maliac Gulf, near the northern extremity of Eubcea < εὐβοσία, good pasturage (*Il.* 2, 683; Thuc. 1, 3; cf. EB<sup>11</sup> 26, 843<sup>ii</sup>). Also *Phthia* may denote *feeding*, pasture-land; cf. *phthisis* (or *φθόη*) consumption, and the Horatian (*Ep.* 1, 2, 27) *fruges consumere nati*. The Greeks were nomads when they invaded the Balkan Peninsula. More than one half of the cultivable area of modern Greece is devoted to pasturage (EB<sup>11</sup> 12, 435<sup>bm</sup>). According to Aristotle, the original home of the Hellenes was not southern Thessaly, but Epirus (*i. e.* southern Albania) which was celebrated for its cattle and its horses. The priests of the most ancient Hellenic sanctuary Dodona were called "Ελλοι = Σέλλοι" (*Il.* 2, 233; 16, 234). According to Hesychius, Σέλλοι = "Ελληνες οἱ ἐν Δωδώνῃ καὶ οἱ ἵερεις (for *καὶ* see *Pur.* 16). We use *pastor* for *minister*, *clergyman*.

In the annals of the Hittite king Morsilis (1337-1312) the name of the old king of Orchomenos, Eteocles (< 'Ετεοκλέφης)

*Sun*, Baltimore, June 29, 1924, Magazine Section, p. 2) that Professor Brested, of Chicago, had found in the tomb of Tut-anh-Amon a manuscript relating to Helen of Troy, is erroneous.

appears as *Tauagalauaš*; the initial vowel is dropped as in Arab. *Taliāni*, Italian, or in Ass. *Sir'ilā'a*, Israelite (JBL 37, 224<sup>i</sup>) and the *k* is partially assimilated to the *l*, as it is in the Biblical *Tiglath-pileser* < Ass. *Tukulti-bal-ešarra* (see above, p. 239). *Tauag(a)lauaš* is called *Ajalauaš*, an Eolian, *Αἴολος* < *Αἴγολος*. In Eolic, particularly in Boeotian and Lesbian, the *f* was persistent. Eteocles is said to have instituted the worship of the Graces; in Theocritus' idyls (16, 104) the Charites are apos-trophized: ὦ Ἐτεόκλειοι θύγατρες. The Hittite king addresses Eteocles *my brother*, a distinction which is bestowed only on the kings of Egypt, Babylonia, and Assyria;<sup>21</sup> so Eteocles must have been a great king like Agamemnon; but as ruler of his colony in Pamphylia (N of Cyprus) he was vassal of the Hittite king, just as George I was king of Great Britain and Ireland as well as elector of Hanover. The name of the father of Eteocles of Orchomenos, Ἀνδρεύς, who was king of *Axxiāuā*, Achaia, and *Lazpa*, Lesbos, c. 1340, is given as *Ant(a)rauas*; the *t* after *n* may have been pronounced *d* as in modern Greek (see above, p. 240). Boeotia continued to be the real centre of Greece down to the Homeric age; the Achean expedition against Troy started from the Boeotian harbor of Aulis (opposite Chalcis at the *Εὔριπος*, the narrowest point of the Euboeic Sea) although the commander-in-chief, Agamemnon, was king of Mycenae in Argolis. The catalog of ships (*Il.* 2, 495) begins with Boeotia. The present population of Boeotia is largely Albanian as it is also in southern Eubœa.

#### 8. Ascanius and Alba Longa.

Lat. *Tusci*, Etruscans (< *Tursci* = *Τυρσηνοί*; cf. Bibl. *Tiras*, Gen. 10, 2) < *Tρωῖσα* > *Tρωῖα* > *Tροῖα*. We can hardly assume (EB<sup>11</sup> 1, 483<sup>b</sup>) that the form *Tyrrhena* is preserved in the Albanian *Tirana*, 20 m E of Durazzo, the ancient Dyrrhachium; cf. the Italian *Tirano* in the Valtellina, near the Swiss frontier, SE of the Piz Bernina in the Upper Engadine. Nor can we accept the derivation of *Tusci* from *θύσκη*, censer < *θύειν* (Plin. 3, 50: *a sacrifico ritu lingua Graecorum Thusci sunt nominati*). The Roman patricians were Etruscans. They took Sabine wives,

<sup>21</sup> For the Assyrian power in the third and second pre-Christian mil-lenaries cf. OLZ 26, 544.

because they refused to intermarry with the subdued Latin population. Connubium between patricians and plebeians was not legalized before 445. Scions of the Roman nobility were called *Trojugenae* (Juvenal 1, 100; 11, 95). The eponymic ancestor of the *Julia gens*, to which Julius Cæsar belonged, was Æneas' son Iulus<sup>22</sup> who is called also Ascanius which is a *nomen gentile*. The *mother* of Rome, Alba Longa, 15 m SE of Rome, near Tusculum, *i. e.* Little Etruria,<sup>23</sup> is said to have been founded by Ascanius whose name may be connected with the Ascanians in Asia Minor and the Biblical Ashkenaz (DB 1, 166) while the *Albani* of Alba Longa and the other *Albenses populi* (Plin. 3, 69) may be identical, not only with the ancient *Albani* at the southwestern shore of the Caspian Sea, N of Armenia, E of Iberia = Georgia, but also with the modern Albanians on the eastern coast of the Adriatic, S of Montenegro which is now merged in Jugo-Slavia. The width of the Strait of Otranto between Albania and Italy is only *c.* 40 m. The Greeks call the Albanians *Αρβανῖται*, while the Turkish name is Arnauts (*Arna'úf* or *Arna'úd*; Albania: *Arnâ'udlúq*).

The old name of the *Tuscan* river Tiber was *Albula* which cannot mean White River; the Tiber is brown or opaque yellowish gray (Hor. *Od.* 1, 2, 13 calls it *flavus*) not white like the Bavarian Isar. The water of the *Albulae Aquae* (4 m W of Tibur) is bluish. Both Tiber (*Tiberinus*) and Tibur (18 m

<sup>22</sup> *Iulus* (or *Ilus*, Verg. *Aen.* 1, 268) must be connected with *Ilium* (< *Ιλύς* which may mean *bottom-land*, well-watered region (*cf.* Gen. 13, 10 and above, p. 48)). This is also the meaning of *Damascus* (PAPS 48, 366<sup>i</sup>). *Cf.* the remarks on *Ἐλός*, above, p. 254. *Dardania* may be explained in the same way; *cf.* the Hesychian *δαρδανεῖν* = *μολύνειν* and the Platonic *ωσπερ θηρίον θειον . . . μολύνεται*. *Marsh* means *meadow* in German. The primary connotation of our *sod*, *turf*, *sward*, is *sodden*, saturated with water. Ger. *Aue*, *meadow*, is connected with Lat. *aqua* > Fr. *eau*, *λευμών* with *λιμνη*, Fr. *gazon*, *sod*, *turf*, *greensward* = Ger. *Wasen* (> *Rasen*; *cf.* JAOS 43, 423) = Fr. *vase*, *mire* = Eng. *ooze* (< *woose*). *Turf* is used in Ireland for *peat* (Ger. *Torf*). Fenlands may be drained, watery swamps and peat-bogs reclaimed for agricultural purposes. Ger. *Matte*, *meadow*, is not connected with Lat. *metere*, to mow, but identical with *Matte*, *mat*: *turf* and *sward* (*cf.* Ger. *Schwarze*, *skin*) form a kind of mat. For *Julius* < *Ilium* *cf.* the derivation of *Judaeus* from *Ida*, the central mountain-range of Crete (Tac. *Hist.* 5, 2).

<sup>23</sup> Several of the chief Roman families were of Tuscan origin.

ENE of Rome) recall the *Tibareni* (=the Bibl. *Tubal*, Gen. 10, 2) SE of the Black Sea; cf. the Ebro ("Ιβηρ, Lat. *Iberus*, *Hiberus*) in Spain (contrast the Thracian *Hebrus*, "Εβρος, i. e. the Maritza) and the Niger in Africa. The name of the Tiburtine sibyl, at the falls of the Anio which joins the Tiber 3 m N of Rome, was *Albunea* (Hor. *Od.* 1, 7, 12).

The southern Albanians (in Epirus) call themselves *Tosk* (= *Tusci*). They are found also in Greece as well as in southern Italy and Sicily. One-tenth of the population of Greece consists of Albanians. The white plaited petticoat known as *fustanelle*, which has been adopted by the Greek men, is a distinct feature of the Albanian costume. Many of the Albanian women in Greece, even in the neighborhood of Athens, are ignorant of Greek. The view (mentioned by Dionysius of Halicarnassus) that the *Albani* in eastern Caucasia were colonists from Alba Longa is very improbable, but the Iberians (*Hiberi*) in Caucasia (Hor. *Epod.* 5, 20; Tac. *Ann.* 6, 34) may have come over land from Spain, and afterwards Iberian *adventurers* (AJP 45, 63) may have sailed from Spain to the Black Sea, just as there seems to have been, at an early date, sea-traffic between the Pyrenean Peninsula and the British Isles, especially Ireland and Cornwall (cf. above, p. 245; JHUC 348, 49, l. 9; OLZ 26, 370).

Albion (which is generally supposed to mean White Land, with reference to the chalk-cliffs of Dover) was an ancient name of the British Isles (Plin. 4, 102) and Albania is used for Scotland. Basques and Albanians have always been excellent sailors. The success of the Greek War of Independence was mainly due to the fleets of Hydra (4 m off the southeastern coast of Argolis) and the majority of the Hydriotes were Albanians. Both Eteocretans and Pelasgians (Strabo 221; OLZ 27, 178<sup>a</sup>) may have belonged to the same race, also the dynastic Egyptians, who founded the kingdoms of Lower and Upper Egypt,<sup>24</sup> while the predynastic Egyptians, who may have come from the northwestern angle of Africa, it may be supposed, were Semites with an aboriginal negroid admixture (EB<sup>11</sup> 9, 43<sup>ss</sup>; 24, 620<sup>a</sup>; 30, 277<sup>b</sup>; contrast ZDMG 63, 524, n. 65). The peculiar features

<sup>24</sup> Strabo (498<sup>i</sup>) speaks of a συγγένεια τις τοῖς Κόλχοις πρὸς τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους. Colchis was at the eastern extremity of the Black Sea, W of Iberia and Albania.

of Egyptian compared with the other Semitic tongues may be due to this Caucasian intrusion. The structural remains of Boghazkeui recall the plans of Cretan palaces in the later Minoan period (EB<sup>11</sup> 13, 537<sup>a</sup>). The neolithic inhabitants of Ireland (which was not invaded by Celts before 600 or 500 B. C. while Celts settled in Asia Minor in 278/7 B. C.) may have been Iberians. *Erin* (> Ireland) = *Erinn*, dative of *Eriu* < *Iveriu*, *Iberiu*, Lat. *Hibernia* (Caes. *B. G.* 5, 13, 2). The early culture of the Iberian Peninsula may antedate the dawn of civilization in Egypt and Babylonia (cf. above, p. 245).

Karl Pauli and Vilhelm Thomsen arrived, independently, at the conclusion that there might be some connection between Etruscan and some of the languages spoken in Caucasia, just as Sumerian is supposed to be related to Georgian.<sup>25</sup> In my paper on Crystal-gazing in the OT (JBL 36, 88; cf. JAOS 42, 373) I quoted Hugo Grotius' statement (1644) that he had no doubt the divination described in Ezek. 21, 26 had been transmitted by the Chaldeans to the Lydians, and by them to the Etruscans (cf. OLZ 25, 492). I also called attention to M. v. Niebuhr's remarks on Etruscan and Basque (cf. OLZ 27, 128<sup>m</sup>. 178<sup>s</sup>).

In Basque the definite article is attached to the end of the word, and we find this postpositive article also in Sumerian as well as in Albanian, Bulgarian, and Rumanian, e. g. Basque *zaldi*, horse; *zaldia*, the horse; *zaldiak*, the horses, which recalls the (non-Aryan) plural ending *-k* or *-q* in Armenian, e. g. *Hay*, Armenian; plur. *Hayq*; Sum. *lugal*, king (prop. *vir magnus*) and *lugal-e*, the king;<sup>26</sup> Alban. *kien*, dog; *kien-i*, the dog; Ruman. *zi*, day; *ziua*, the day; Bulg. *zhena-ta*, the woman. The suffix article in Albanian, Rumanian, and Bulgarian, is due, it may be supposed, to the influence of the aboriginal (Caucasian) speech of the Balkan Peninsula, and certain non-Aryan peculiarities of Armenian must be explained in the same way (cf. OLZ 25, 145; 26, 565, l. 7; 27, 51, l. 7). Basque *bi*, two; *lau*, four, might be combined with Sum. *min*, two; *limmu* (or *lam-*

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Ph. C. Karl Kramář, *Über die sumerisch-gruzinische Spracheinheit* (Prag, 1904) and JRAS, 1910, p. 53; OLZ 27, 176; JAOS 44, 167<sup>m</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> See SB § 61; Poebel §§ 130. 156. 223. 342. 344.

*mu* > *lauuu* > *la'u*, *lau*; cf. AJP 39, 307<sup>i</sup>; JAOS 43, 122, l. 7) four. There is a postposition *-ra*, toward, to (cf. AJSL 22, 261) in both Sumerian (OLZ 27, 169<sup>i</sup>) and Basque, and the Basque pronouns *gu*, we; *zu*, ye, may correspond to Sum. *-me*, our; *-zu*, thine. The pronoun for *I* in Sumerian should be read *ga-e* (cf. *ki-gu*, with me, SG § 25, f) not *ma-e* (see CV 37; JAOS 37, 322<sup>i</sup>; cf. Poebel, § 182).<sup>27</sup> The affixed *e* is demonstrative like the *e* in *lugal-e*, the king, or the prefixed *an* in Semitic *an-ta*, thou. For Poebel's objection (§ 177) cf. Syr. *lî-hû 'ăbadtôn* (Matt. 25, 40) ye have done it unto *me* (Nöldeke, Syr. Gr.<sup>2</sup> § 221).

Herodotus (1, 93) states that Lydian girls gained their dowries by prostitution (like some of the Japanese Geishas) and Plautus (*Cistell.* 2, 3, 19) calls this a Tuscan custom (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 4, 55). The *vicus Tuscus* in Rome had a bad reputation. Horace (*Sat.* 2, 3, 228) speaks of the *Tusci turba impia vici*. The Etruscans are said to have come from Lydia to Italy by sea in the 12th century, *i. e.* after the destruction of Troy *c.* 1184. Of course, there may also have been Etruscans who came from Asia Minor to Italy over land across the Alps. Piacenza, where the famous bronze liver was found in 1877,<sup>28</sup> is not far from Milan.

PAUL HAUPT.

<sup>27</sup> For Sum. *g < y < m* (cf. Fr. *gué*, ford = It. *guado* = Lat. *vadum*; Fr. *guède*, woad, *lóáris* = Lat. *vitrum*) see ZDMG 69, 564; ZA 31, 247; JAOS 37, 314<sup>i</sup>. In Old Welsh, initial *w* (*v*) became *gu* (*gw*) in the course of the 9th century (EB<sup>11</sup> 5, 618<sup>b*i*</sup>).

<sup>28</sup> See EB<sup>11</sup> 20, 103<sup>b*m*</sup>; Pauly<sup>2</sup> 6, 727, 28; KAT<sup>2</sup> 605, 6; Jastrow, *Rel.* 2, 219; OLZ 26, 493, ll. 4. 8.

### III.—ON SOME THEORIES CONCERNING THE COMPOSITION OF THE AENEID.

In our laudable eagerness to gain some knowledge of Vergil's method in writing his Aeneid we are apt, it seems to me, to forget that the poem, even in the unfinished state in which he left it, is a glorious masterpiece of literary art. It follows, therefore, that we have no right to detach a passage or a line from it in order to support any theory of ours concerning the poet's method of work unless we first see whether the passage or the line does not owe its position to the dramatic situation, to the part it plays in the artistic whole.

The contrary practice, however, seems to be the rule in many of the attempts which have been made to determine the relative order of composition of the various books. Even though all the evidence which might bear on this question is open to all men, from it have been drawn the most conflicting conclusions, such, for example, as that the third book is the earliest of all the books, that the third book is the latest,—and Sabbadini at different times held both views,—that the first book preceded the fifth, that the fifth preceded the first, that the seventh book was written in the last year of the poet's life, that the seventh book was written before the third and fifth, and so on. That such conflicting conclusions should be drawn from the same evidence is proof not only that the evidence is not of a convincing character, but that little effort has been made to see whether the passages which are cited in support of this or that theory may not be more simply explained by reference to the poet's art.

Any discussion of this matter of the relation between the books as regards the time of composition, should begin, it seems to me, with the statement in the Donatus *Vita* 23 (34) : *Aeneida prosa prius oratione formatam digestamque in XII libros, particulatim componere instituit, prout liberet quidque, et nihil in ordinem arripiens*; that is, that Vergil first wrote out in prose the matter of his Aeneid and arranged it into twelve books, and that he then began to turn it into verse working by episodes. The fact that the Aeneid, as we have it, with its slight inconsistencies and incomplete lines, is just what would

result from such a method of composition is assurance of the truth of this statement. If we cannot accept it, then no reliance can be placed on any item of information which Suetonius has preserved for us. If we do accept it, it follows that the relation of each book to the others of the twelve, at the time Vergil began to put them into verse, must have been on the whole about as it is now. Minor changes there no doubt were, but any such radical change in the general plan, such, for example, as that postulated by Noack,<sup>1</sup> is unthinkable. It follows, too, that if Vergil worked his prose version into verse by episodes, it is practically impossible for us to tell with any degree of certainty in what order the poetic version of the books was made.

The question arises, then, may not some, at least, of the evidence from which such conflicting conclusions have been drawn, be of such a nature that it can be explained by reference to the poet's artistic sense and to the dramatic economy of the poem? What follows will testify to my own belief, at least, that this question should be answered in the affirmative. It is well to bear in mind the words of Claudius Donatus, *Interpr. Verg. I*, p. 6 (Georgii): *Vergilius—non adserentis officio ductus est, sed pro tempore pro persona pro loco pro causa adstruxit ista.*

According to Heinze,<sup>2</sup> whose views must always be received with respect, when Vergil wrote books I, II, IV, VI, his idea was to have the Trojans, even before they left Troy, know both the name of the land to which they were going (cf. IV, 345: *sed nunc Italianam magnam Gryneus Apollo, / Italianam Lyciae iussere capessere sortis*), and the name of its river (cf. II, 781 sq.: *Creusa's shade speaks to Aeneas, Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva / inter . . . fluit—Thybris*); that, on the other hand, when he wrote book III, his idea was to have the knowledge of their destination come as a gradual enlightenment. If, then, Vergil had written the third book before the others, there was no reason, thinks Heinze, why he should have given up this plan for one so different that it would have necessitated many

<sup>1</sup> *Die Erste Aeneis Vergils*, Herm. XXVII, 1892, pp. 407 sq.

<sup>2</sup> *Virgils Epische Technik*,<sup>3</sup> p. 87. For opposing views, cf. Karsten, Herm. XXXIX, 1904, pp. 259 sq.; Dessau, Herm. XL, 1914, pp. 508 sq.

changes in order to bring the third book into harmony with it. If, however, the third book was written after the others, then the reference in these others to a definite end of the wanderings can easily be explained as "vorläufige Versuche."

There are, however, several obstacles in the way of this theory which Heinze himself recognizes but which, after the common fashion of us all when we do not like obstacles to stand in the way of our theories, he tries to avoid in a foot-note. Chief of these obstacles is III, 500, where Aeneas says to Andromache, *si quando Thybrim vicinaque Thybridis arva / intraro.* This knowledge on the hero's part of the name of the river of his promised land stands, says Heinze, p. 88, n. 1, in direct contrast to the plan of this third book in which no where is the Tiber named or Latium, even in the prophecy of Helenus. The line must have been due, therefore, to a slip of the poet (*Versehen des Dichters*), who had not completely freed himself from his earlier idea of having his hero know beforehand the definite name of the place to which he was bound. On the other hand, the definite references in book I (205, 380, 530, 553), book IV (345, 432, where Dido mentions Latium), book VI (67), could not have been due to a slip since, in these books, there is no hint that to Aeneas, "die Lage der neuen Heimat unbekannt sei."

This verse 500 of book III also bothers Miss Crump<sup>3</sup> who, following Conrad and Sabbadini, thinks that book III was the earliest of all, the original order of the books having been III, I, II. She is led to this conclusion by the, to her, inferior artistic beauty of III, for she does not see how Vergil, after writing II or IV or VI, could have fallen back to such a low level in III. She disposes of the line by saying that III, 495-505 were a later addition inserted after the end of II was written, III, 495 being a direct reference to II, 780,—and concludes that Vergil thus attempted to harmonize III with II, even though these verses are not in harmony with the rest of III. She finds other discrepancies, also, between III and the other books as follows: that, whereas seven years of wandering are mentioned in I, 755, and V, 626, no definite number is mentioned in III, which gives the impression that a short time has

<sup>3</sup> *The Growth of the Aeneid*, Oxford, 1920.

elapsed (this is a tribute, surely, to Vergil's skill somewhat inconsistent with her opinion of III in general); that I, 382, *matre dea monstrante viam data fata secutus*, and I, 407-8, *quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis / ludis imaginibus?* are not borne out by any reference in III; that, finally, whereas in book I, Venus and Juno play the chief rôles as protectress and enemy respectively of the hero, they are unimportant in III in which, on the other hand, Apollo stands in the forefront. Hence, in her opinion, I, 1-33 were added after I and II were written and after III was put in the place it now occupies.

In this matter of the part which the gods play in these books Heinze, too, finds a discrepancy. He does not think, however, that this discrepancy is evidence of a change of plan on the poet's part, or that Vergil felt any discrepancy. In writing I, 1-33, Vergil was imitating the prooemion of the *Odyssey*, and since, when writing III, no opportunity presented itself for a display of Juno's enmity, he could justify his procedure by Homer's example in the case of Odysseus,<sup>4</sup> whose sufferings were due to the anger of Poseidon but who, even if he was conscious of this fact, makes no mention of it. That Vergil had this parallel in mind is shown, thinks Heinze, by Helenus' words in III, 435 sq.: *unum illud tibi, nate dea, proque omnibus unum / praedicam et repetens iterumque iterumque monebo: / Iunonis magnae primum prece numen adora, / Iunoni cane vota libens dominamque potentem / supplicibus supera donis.* These words are modelled, says Heinze, on the words of Teiresias to Odysseus in  $\lambda$ , 100 sq.; in both passages there is a warning for the future and no reference is made to the effect of the god's wrath in the past. So Venus also remains in the background throughout III, and there is nothing in Aeneas' narrative to Dido to show that during the greater part of his voyage he received any aid or comfort from her. In this regard Vergil, he thinks,

<sup>4</sup> The ways of criticism are strange! Whereas Heinze tries to explain what he considers inconsistencies in III by Homer's practice in the *Odyssey*, Noack, who agrees with him in regard to the time of composition of III, finds very few reminiscences of the *Odyssey* in III but many of the *Iliad*.

when he wrote I, had planned differently, as is shown by Aeneas' words to Venus in I, 382 and 407 (quoted above). These lines, however, do not imply necessarily that the poet was working with any definite plan in mind, since here again Vergil could justify himself by the analogy of Homer's treatment of Athena in the *Odyssey*. Hence he is inclined to see in the falsis imaginibus of 1, 407, a reminiscence of Athena's shape-shiftings in her dealings with Odysseus. The reproach contained in the line is, however, meaningless in the light of the fully developed plan of III, and had Vergil lived to revise his poem he would, Heinze thinks, have probably corrected the lack of reference.

These passages from Heinze and Miss Crump I have cited because they furnish the chief support for their conclusions regarding the relation of book III to the others of the first six. The fact that their conclusions are diametrically opposed is justification, it seems to me, for this attempt to consider the lines which they quote from the *Aeneid* in the light of Vergil's artistic conception and purpose.

Let us turn first to lines 1-33 of book I. Miss Crump considers the connection between them and line 34 more abrupt than would have been the case had Vergil written them at, so to speak, one sitting. She concludes, therefore, as we have seen, that they were written after the rest of I was composed, at the time when Vergil decided to make I the new first book instead of III which stood originally in the first place. Heinze considers the lines as a prooemion written in imitation of the prooemion of the *Odyssey* without definite thought how the details which were to follow would correspond to it. Noack sees two prooemia; lines 1-7 are the prooemion to the entire twelve books. The first draft of the poem, however, consisting of books I, II, IV, VI, which Vergil wrote under the influence of the *Odyssey*, may well have begun with line 8, *Musa, mihi causas memora, quo numine laeso*, with which he compares *Ody. a, 1: Ἀνδρα μοι ἔινεπε, μοῦσα.*

Such ideas as these of Heinze and Noack are an illustration of a fault common to criticism of Vergil since the time of Macrobius and Servius, namely, that of assuming that, because Vergil wrote an epic, he wrote an Homeric epic. This is the fault into

which Professor Bassett falls, when he criticizes<sup>5</sup> the beginning of the Aeneid as an "over-elaboration," and says that Vergil, by introducing the reasons for Juno's wrath "artlessly explains the cause of the wanderings and hardships of his hero before he begins to tell the story," that is, according to him, at line 34. No one, of course, will deny that Vergil employs the machinery of Homer, and that in writing the prooemion to book I there came into his mind the opening lines not only of the *Odyssey* but also of the *Iliad*. It does not follow, however, that Vergil wrote, in the sense that Homer wrote, the narrative of "the wanderings and hardships" of one hero only, for he did not. What Vergil wrote was the epic, or rather the drama, of a great people, of the genus *Latinum / Albanique patres atque altae moenia Romae* (7), of which that hero was the founder. What, one may ask, has this in common with Homer? In the history of that people one event stood out above all others, an event to which they owed in part their greatness and their place in the world, the long, bitter, but triumphant struggle with Carthage. From the beginning of that struggle the Romans realized its meaning, and the fancy of the people, no less than the fancy of poets, saw in it the reflexion of a struggle between divine forces, between Juno, the enemy of the Trojans and their descendants, the Romans, and patron goddess of Carthage, Rome's great enemy, and Venus and Jupiter representing the divine will that from the Trojans, *populum late regem belloque superbum / venturum excidio Libyae*. So Naevius and so Ennius had visualized the struggle,<sup>6</sup> and Horace quickened the old idea into new life by his glorious third ode of book III. Hence it is that Vergil ends his prooemion with a prayer to the Muse to tell him the reasons for Juno's wrath (8-12); hence his narrative begins not with line 34 but with line 12, with the name of Carthage, the city of Juno's love, which she had planned, *si qua fata sinant*, to make the capitol of the world; hence the reference in line 20 to the glory of Rome that was to be, and to those (not one hero only, Aeneas is not mentioned in lines 12-33), the

<sup>5</sup> The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, A. J. P. XLIV, 1923, p. 339, n. 1, and p. 344.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Macr. S. VI, 2, 31; Serv. ad Aen. I, 20.

reliquiae Danaum atque inmitis Achillis, who, in spite of the hostility of Juno, were to make that glory possible. There is, therefore, no break between lines 33-4; Juno is still the real subject, and the narrative of her position as patron goddess of Carthage and of her hatred of the Trojans (not of one hero only) is continued dramatically by her soliloquy, 36 sq., which introduces the great drama of the gods' part in the destiny of Rome. Juno is successful in her first attempt to hinder the fulfillment of that destiny; the storm falls upon the deep and the happiness with which the band of Trojans had left Sicily (35) is turned to tears. And then, in this dark hour for the mortal actors in the drama, who cannot know or understand their lot, we are carried up into heaven where Jupiter unfolds to the sorrowing mother-goddess the glorious destiny, not of her son only, but of his descendants, and announces Juno's renunciation of her wrath (280) to join with him in favoring Romanos rerum dominos gentemque togatam (282), until the culmination of their glory in the reign of peace and law under Augustus. Again we may ask, what has this in common with Homer? Or what right have we to judge Vergil's epic drama from the point of view of Homer's epic narrative, Vergil's conception by Homer's?

The opening lines of the Aeneid, therefore, far from having been written under the domination of Homer's prooemia, far from being a mere over-elaboration, an artless explanation of the causes of the hero's hardships, far from being an abrupt introduction written under the compulsion of a change of plan, have nothing, save a phrase or two, in common with Homer's prooemia; they contain no more and no less than is needed to indicate, by a surpassing artistry, the poet's conception of his whole, and they stand in the most intimate connection with that whole as well as with the lines immediately following them.

In the first book also are two other lines which loom large in the arguments of Heinze and Miss Crump; I, 382: matre dea monstrante viam data fata secutus, and 407, quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis / ludis imaginibus? To Heinze, since in III there is nothing *in Aeneas' narrative* (the italics are mine) to show that during the greater part of his

wandering, he had received any aid or comfort from Venus, and no reference is made to even one falsa *imago*, this is evidence that Vergil had planned when writing book I to make Venus play a leading rôle, but gave up Venus for Apollo when writing book III. Miss Crump likewise thinks the lines are inconsistent with book III, but her conclusion from this (assumed) inconsistency is, that Vergil neglected to make the details in I correspond with the matter in the earlier III.

Let us notice, first, the relation between these lines and the immediate context. Venus, after hearing from Jupiter the *fatum Romanum* must, in the joy of her heart, see her son, must with her own lips assure him of the safety of his companions and of an hospitable reception by Dido, the queen of the land to which he has come, a queen who, like Aeneas, as Venus is careful to tell him, had been a wanderer and an outcast but, unlike Aeneas, has found a home and peace. I need not pause here to emphasize the irony of this situation,—a mother, and the protecting divinity of the Roman people, leading her son, the ancestor of that people, into a situation which was to bring about his own moral undoing and to cause a century of woe to Rome. This irony, however, if nothing else, would justify the bitterness and the pathos of Aeneas' reply to his mother's question as to his identity, *sum pius Aeneas—* *conscendi navibus aequor / matre dea monstrante viam data fata secutus.* No wonder his goddess-mother could suffer him to say no more; no wonder that her love prompted her to reveal herself, if but for a moment, to him; no wonder that her heartsick son, whose hopes had again been mocked, should cry out as she turned from him, *quid natum totiens, crudelis tu quoque, falsis / ludis imaginibus?* From the point of view of poetry what could surpass these lines? They are in perfect harmony with the situation of the characters involved, they are true from the point of view of art, even if Venus had never before this moment showed herself to her suffering son. That was enough for the poet who wrote them, even if it does not satisfy his critics who think that he should have given a cross reference to some other book of his poem, or to the *Odyssey*.

Are these lines (382, 407), however, inconsistent with anything in the other books? In regard to 382, it is to be noted

that Aeneas does not say to Venus, "my mother led me during all my wanderings," but simply, "I set sail with my mother pointing out my way, following prophecies of the gods." Servius may have been right in seeing in this line a reference to the tradition that Venus' star did guide the Trojans, and Vergil may have had the tradition in mind again when he wrote II, 801, where Aeneas and his followers are making ready to set sail: *iamque iugis summae surgebat Lucifer Idae / ducebatque diem*; the fata may be those referred to in III, 363, IV, 345. However this may be, could Vergil make Aeneas in book III tell Dido that his goddess-mother was his guide and protector during his wanderings when these had meant nothing but suffering and "hopes deferred?" Or, again, how could he tell her that his mother had mocked him by showing herself now and then and, as far as he knew, without aiding him in his moments of dire distress? What a mother and what a guide! Surely in Aeneas' *own narrative to Dido* there was no place for Venus, and we have no right to cite omissions and insertions, which are absolutely essential from the artistic standpoint, as evidence for any theory for the priority of this or that book.

What is true of Venus' absence from book III is true, also, of Juno's. "Strange," cry the critics, "that Vergil should have made Juno so prominent in book I and then have left her out of III! He must have been imitating Homer, or else changed his plan." But is it strange? Although Aeneas knows that Juno had been the enemy of Troy,—the vision of her pitiless figure had been vouchsafed him when his city fell,—he did not know, as far, at least, as the poem tells us, that her enmity was still pursuing the Trojans any more than he knew that in the distant day of Rome's future she would join with Jupiter in favoring his descendants. But even if Aeneas had known, how could he have told Dido? Remember the situation. When Aeneas enters Dido's rising city, the first sight which meets his gaze is the splendid temple which the queen is building in honor of her patron goddess, Juno. On its walls he sees pictured by a sympathetic hand the story of his people's sufferings and the cruelty of their conquerors: *hic primum Aeneas sperare salutem / ausus et afflictis melius confidere rebus* (I, 451-2). In the light of the opening lines of the poem and of Rome's rela-

tion to Carthage the masterly irony of this whole passage is apparent. To this temple comes the radiant Dido, happy in her task of establishing her new city, and at its doors she seats herself upon her throne; here it is that she receives the shipwrecked Trojans and with generous sympathy extends to them her all. And later, when Tyrians and Trojans crowd the banquet hall and "ancestral ceremonies are kindled into life," it is the queen who prays, 730 sq.: *Iuppiter—hunc laetum Tyriisque diem Troiaque profectis / esse velis nostrosque huius meminisse minores* (again note the irony); *adsit laetitiae Bacchus dator et bona Iuno.*

Surely in the light of this relationship between Dido and Juno, a relationship which Vergil is so careful to emphasize both here and, by implication, in the opening lines of the poem, it was impossible for him from the point of view of his art, to say nothing of that of good taste, to have made Aeneas, even if he was conscious of Juno's hostility, set forth that fact to Dido. Had he done so there could have been, as far as poetic art is concerned, no story. For, if Dido had known of Juno's undying hatred of the Trojans, or if Aeneas had known of Juno's purpose to make Carthage mistress of the world, there could have been no problem of the conflict of human loves with the divine will which Vergil makes the subject of his fourth book. And yet Vergil has succeeded in reminding us in book III of Juno's position and in a way that is most impressive and in entire harmony with the dramatic situation. Aeneas quotes to Dido the prophecy of Helenus—a Trojan, note, one who, just as other Trojans, has suffered from the hostility of Juno. The very climax of his prophecy, however, is a solemn warning to Aeneas (435 sq.), that he must pay homage to the power of Juno, must make his prayers to Juno, and with suppliant gifts sue the favor of that sovereign mistress. The words are carefully chosen so that there is no hint to Dido who hears them of the real relation of Juno to this stranger who is to mean so much to her. Heinze's explanation of the passage as due to a reminiscence of the *Odyssey*, λ, 100 sq., is entirely superfluous; there is little similarity between the two passages save, as he notes, that they both refer to the future. But to what other sphere of time a prophecy can refer I do not see, and it is of the future, and, be it noted, the immediate future, concerning which

Aeneas has asked: *fare age—quae prima pericula vito / quidve sequens tantos possim superare labores?* (362 sq.). The very indefiniteness of Helenus' words throws an atmosphere of mystery over what is still hidden while, at the same time, they recall to the reader the drama of the gods foreshadowed in book I.

The position of Apollo in III is simply and satisfactorily explained by the position of Apollo as god of colonists and by his relation to the religious reforms instituted by Augustus,—a delicate compliment to the Emperor and another link connecting the legendary past with Vergil's own vital present. It is to be noted, however, that Vergil is careful to connect Apollo with the wanderings of his hero from the very beginning, for in IV, 345 Aeneas tells Dido, *Italiam magnam Gryneus Apollo, / Italiam Lyciae iussere capessere sortis*, and in VI, 56, Aeneas prays to Apollo, Phoebe, *gravis Troiae semper miseratae labores, —tot maria intravi duce te penitusque repostas / Massylum gentis praetentaque Syrtibus arva.*

It is line 500 of book III, however, which Heinze and Miss Crump find most awkward for their theories, and we have seen by what diverse methods they have tried to make it support their diverse views. But this line, too, like the others which I have considered is so suited to its context, arises so naturally out of the situation, that it cannot be used to support any conclusion save that Vergil was a poet.

Aeneas, when in Crete, learns for the first time, from the Penates (III, 163 sq.), that the *terra Hesperia*, a name which he, at least, had heard (cf. II, 781), was identical with *Italia*, of which the *Grynnian Apollo* and other oracles had spoken (cf. above and III, 363), and Anchises (180 sq.) confirms this identification by recalling a prophecy of Cassandra, to which, naturally enough, no one had paid any attention.<sup>7</sup> Henceforth *Italia* is uppermost in Aeneas' mind and the dire prophecy of the Harpies, which soon follows, only serves to keep it so.

<sup>7</sup> It will be noticed that Vergil is careful here as everywhere to make the intervention of superhuman agents fit in with the psychological situation of his human characters. The pestilence and famine which have visited the Trojans are evidence that Crete cannot be their promised land, and Anchises has bidden his son return to Delos again to ask Apollo's will. All, therefore, that Aeneas had ever heard about

When, therefore, he meets Helenus, priest of Apollo, and questions him concerning the future, the word *Italia*, pregnant now with hope and dread, springs first to his lips (364). Helenus' first words, however, contain small comfort, for he tells him that that *Italia* which he, in his blindness (*ignarus*), thinks near, is still far, far away, and that many dangers still lie ahead. Nor of the final end of his wanderings does Helenus tell him exactly,—the *prima pericula* (367) are naturally emphasized,—only that he will recognize the end by finding near a secluded stream, *secreti ad fluminis undam* (389), a sow all white with thirty young all white (392). Then, when the time comes for Aeneas' departure, Helenus' last words but emphasize the hopelessness of it all,—*Ausoniae* (cf. *terras Ausonias* in the Penates' prophecy, 171), *pars illa procul quam pandit Apollo* (479). Hence these words are in Aeneas' mind when he bids farewell to the prophet and to Andromache and looks his last upon the new Troy of their make-believe and contrasts the woe and hopelessness of his future with their *fortuna peracta* (493), lines 495 sq.:

vobis parta quies: nullum maris aequor arandum,  
arva neque Ausoniae semper cedentia retro  
quaerenda. Effigiem Xanthi Troiamque videtis:—

They have their river and a city called by the dear old names, and he, too, has a river, the Thybris of Creusa's prophecy, and if ever he will find it and the fields along its banks, *si quando Thybrim vicinaque Thybridis arva / intraro* (500-1), and see the city builded for his people, then he and they will make of Epirus and Hesperia one Troy (501-505).

Line 500 is, therefore, so nicely fitted to the context that any theory which considers it merely as a part of a passage added by the poet to harmonize one book with another is untenable. The context, too, makes it clear that to Aeneas the Thybris is still but a name, its exact location still unknown, and Heinze's assumption that the line is not in harmony with the plan of this third book is equally untenable. Moreover, even if the poet had not told us that Aeneas had heard the name Thybris, the

the end of his voyage must have come into his mind as he lay upon his bed wondering about the meaning of the dark prophecies. He falls into a restless sleep, during which the Penates come and half solve the riddle.

use of the name here, after the reference to the river Xanthus, would, from the point of view of poetic art, have been entirely justifiable.

The poet has, however, told us how Aeneas learned the name, and the occasion when he learned it was one which inevitably was in Aeneas' mind at this moment of parting from Helenus and Andromache. The meeting with these two had made the sad past live again and with it the wife whom he had loved and lost, to whose son Andromache has just spoken (489) her sad farewell. It is Creusa's words, therefore, concerning the river of the promised land which come to his mind as he leaves this new Troy built on the banks of a new Xanthus, but clearly the location of that river is now no better known than it was at the time he first heard the name, his hopes of finding it seemingly no nearer realization.

For the words of Creusa's prophecy, II, 780 sq.: *terram Hesperiam venies, ubi Lydius arva / inter opima virum leni fluit agmine Thybris*, far from giving to Aeneas any definite information concerning the end of his voyage and the location of his future kingdom, as Heinze would have us believe, are in reality the darkest of all the fata. Surely the poet meant us to understand that to Aeneas *terra Hesperia* could have meant only "the land in the west," and *Lydius Thybris* only "the Thybris of Lydia."<sup>8</sup> Vergil, therefore, is using the prophecy as others had used it before him,<sup>9</sup> to give directions which seem explicit and final on the face of them and are yet not so, or which give the name of a place and not its situation, another instance of that irony which, as I have noted, Vergil employs with such fine effect throughout this whole story of his hero's wanderings. Vergil is careful, moreover, to show us that to Aeneas the location of the Tiber, of Latium, even of Italy was throughout unknown. He and his companions begin their voyage "doubtful whither the prophecies (those of Creusa and of Apollo) were

<sup>8</sup> It is worth noting that it is only here in the Aeneid that Vergil applies this epithet to the Tiber. Strictly the term is an anachronism, but it is justifiable in Creusa's mouth since she, for this moment, at least, is an omniscient divinity, and he may have intended its use to make the prophecy, from Aeneas' point of view, more meaningless than ever.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Heinze, I. c., p. 85.

to lead them," III, 7. Nor does Helenus' prophecy remove the doubt, inasmuch as he gives specific directions concerning the immediate hazards only (the *prima pericula* of Aeneas' question), and does not mention either Latium or the Tiber. Aeneas' own words in III, 500 show that he knows nothing of the location of the river, and he receives no enlightenment, of course, during his stay in Carthage. Hence, after his return from Carthage to Sicily, as he stands by his father's tomb, the hopelessness of his quest, his uncertainty of the location of the promised land and its river, finds pathetic expression: V, 82, *non licuit finis Italos fataliaque arva / nec tecum Ausonium quicumque est quaerere Thybrim*. These words afford clear evidence, surely, that Vergil did not want us to understand that Creusa's prophecy in II, 780 sq. conveyed to Aeneas any definite information as to the end of his voyage.

One would assume, therefore, that, since in V Vergil represents his hero as being ignorant of the location of his new home, he must have been ignorant of it during his stay in Carthage, and I see nothing in the lines quoted by Heinze in support of the contrary view to disprove this assumption. Vergil certainly makes it as clear as a poet can or need throughout the first six books that to Aeneas and his followers there were known certain prophecies concerning a promised land to which he was to lead them. The exact situation of this land they are not told, nor did the prophecies agree as to its name. This some gave as *terra Hesperia*, or simply *Hesperia*, so the mad Cassandra (III, 185) and Creusa who, speaking to Aeneas only, connects with it a river, *Lydius Thybris*; others as *Italia* (cf. I, 380; III, 364; IV, 345; VI, 61); others, we must suppose, since the poet need not tell us every detail, as *Latium* (I, 205; 554; VI, 67). No one of these names, however, could have meant more to the Trojans than another, and not until they are in Crete do they learn that *Hesperia* and *Italy* are one. Thus *Italia*, even though its exact location is still unknown, becomes something more definite, and Helenus' prophecy, full of mystery as it is, disappointing as it is in regard to the goal, assures them of its reality and of the purpose of the gods that they shall settle therein. *Italia, Italia*, is their glad cry when they first behold it (III, 523). Full of happiness, therefore, they leave Sicily (I, 35), from which, according to Helenus, they will reach the

land of their hope, *finis Italos* (III, 440). Then comes the storm, they are ship-wrecked on a desolate shore, Italia has once more proved an empty dream.

Here, when their leader, with a smile upon his lips, although his heart is as heavy as theirs (I, 208), tries to reassure them, what can he say? The very logic of the situation requires some reference to their goal other than Italia; the word is now, so to speak, one of bad omen. We may catch an echo of their feelings regarding it in the hopelessness of Aeneas' reply to his mother a little later, I, 380 sq.: *Italiam quaero—Europa atque Asia pulsus*. Hence it is that the poet makes his hero say *Latium not Italia*, I, 205 sq.: *tendimus in Latium sedes ubi fata* ("prophecies") *quietas ostendunt*. Even though we are not told definitely from what *fatum* the Trojans had learned the name, there is certainly nothing in these words to show, as Heinze maintains, that to the Trojans—and Vergil is writing from their point of view, not from ours—the exact location of Latium was any better known than that of Italia had been. We see from Ilioneus' words in I, 530 sq., 554 sq., that it was not. *Est locus*<sup>10</sup> is as definite as he can be; he knows its names, *Hesperia, Italia, Latium*, so much he has heard from the old prophecies or from his leader; but without that leader he makes it clear that the quest is hopeless, and that *Sicily*, where at least there were *sedes paratae* (I, 557), would have to serve them as their new home. So, too, Aeneas, in his address to Dido, 595 sq., speaks as one uncertain of his goal: *semper honos nomenque tuum laudesque manebunt, / quae me cumque vocant terrae*.

The situation in IV is, of course, the same as in I, and what is true of the references to Italia and Latium in the one is true of the references in the other. In both not only do these references carry no idea of the definite location of the promised land, but they arise naturally out of the dramatic situation. During that winter of sweet sin, so long to all but Aeneas and

<sup>10</sup> Lines I, 530-534 are found also in III, 163-166, which the poet has put in the mouth of the Penates when they, acting for Apollo, speak to Aeneas. In themselves, however, since they are suited to the context in both places, they afford no evidence on which to decide which passage was written first. *Alii alia putant*; cf. Heinze, p. 89, n. 2.

Dido (IV, 193), Vergil makes it clear<sup>11</sup> that Aeneas often thought of Italia and all that it implied of duty and responsibility to his son; hence the emphasis which is put upon *regnum Hesperiae* (355) and *regnum Italiae*, in Mercury's message from Jupiter (IV, 275). And the moral awaking of the hero brings with it, therefore, the realization that he must sacrifice his love to his duty and continue his quest for that Italia of the prophecies which Mercury's words recall,—if, indeed, they were ever far from his consciousness; hence his reply to Dido, 345, *Italiam magnam Gryneus Apollo, / Italiam Lyciae iussere capessere sortis*. That Dido in 432 should mention Latium is not surprising since she had heard this name from Ilioneus (I, 554), if not from Aeneas himself.

This summary, imperfect as it is, will make it apparent, I trust, that every line in the first six books in which reference is made to the end of Aeneas' wanderings arises naturally out of the dramatic situation, and that in each case the form of expression chosen by the poet finds its justification in this fact. From the point of view of the poet's art this is all that is necessary, but we may, I think, go farther and say that there is no such serious disagreement between these references as to justify any definite conclusion regarding the priority of this or that book in which they occur. On the other hand they do justify the conclusion that the poet, in telling of the wanderings of his hero, had from the beginning one plan in mind, namely, that the name, or rather the names, of the promised land should be known to Aeneas and the Trojans before their departure from Asia, but that only gradually should there come to them enlightenment as to the meaning of these names, their essential oneness, and the exact location of the haven which they designated.

M. B. OGLE.

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. IV, 351 sq. where Aeneas justifies to Dido his decision to return to his duty, *me patris Anchisae, quotiens umentibus umbris / nox operit terras,—me puer Ascanius capitisque iniuria cari, / quem regno Hesperiae fraudo et fatalibus arvis*. Heinze's objection that we should have been told of these visions before Mercury's visit is nonsense; Aeneas has not yielded without a struggle between his love and his duty, just as Dido has not (460 sq.), but he could not have told her of it any more than she could have told him.

#### IV.—NOTES ON JUVENAL, I, III, VI, X.

##### SATIRE I. JUVENAL'S PREFACE (1-13).

Semper ego auditor tantum? numquamne reponam  
vexatus quotiens rauci Theseide Cordi?  
impune ergo mihi recitaverit ille togatas,  
hic elegos? impune diem consumpsit ingens  
Telephus aut summi plena iam margine libri  
scriptus et in tergo needum finitus Orestes?  
nota magis nulli domus est sua quam mihi lucus  
Martis et Aeoliis vicinum rupibus antrum  
Vulcani; quid agant venti, quas torqueat umbras  
Aeacus, unde alias furtivae devehat aurum  
pelliculae, quantas iaculetur Monychus ornos,  
Frontonis platani convulsaque marmora clamant  
semper et adsiduo ruptae lectore columnae.

The commentators do not seem to have noticed how closely these lines resemble Vergil's preface to *Georgics* III (3 sqq.):

cetera quae vacuas tenuissent carmine mentes  
omnia iam vulgata: quis aut Eurysthea durum,  
aut inlaudati nescit Busiridis aras?  
cui non dictus Hylas puer<sup>1</sup> et Latonia Delos  
Hippodameque umeroque Pelops insignis eburno,  
acer equis?

Here as in the early mention of the levee in *Georg.* II. 461 sq.,

si non ingentem foribus domus alta superbis  
mane salutantum totis vomit aedibus undam,

Vergil suggests the theme of the later poet. But Vergil is deserting the well-worn stories of Greek mythology to write about the exploits of Augustus:

in medio mihi Caesar erit templumque tenebit (1. 16),

while Juvenal's choice of a modern subject is caused by the vices and follies of contemporary Rome, and his model is Lu-cilius, *secuit Lucilius urbem* (Persius I. 114). This *timeliness* of his satire is stressed by Juvenal throughout his preface.

<sup>1</sup> Mayor and Friedländer quote this on Juv. I. 164, multum quaesitus Hylas.

It comes up a second time in lines 52 sqq.:

haec ego non agitem? sed quid magis? Heracleas  
aut Diomedes aut mugitum labyrinthi, etc.,

and a third time at the end, 163 sqq.:

nulli gravis est percussus Achilles  
aut multum quaesitus Hylas urnamque secutus:  
ense velut stricto quotiens Lucilius ardens  
infremuit, etc.,

thus closing on the same note on which he began (cp. *magnus-Auruncae-alumnus*, I. 20). It is this symmetrical arrangement of the poem to which I especially wish to call attention, in view particularly of Nettleship's criticisms of "the ill-proportioned piece," in which so many of the commentators concur.<sup>2</sup>

Another example of three-fold repetition is the *lectica* of the criminal profiteer, which annoys Juvenal in much the same way as an automobile a pedestrian today.

1) lines 30-33:

nam quis iniquae  
tam patiens urbis tam ferreus ut teneat se  
causidici nova cum veniat lectica Mathonis  
plena ipso?

2) lines 63-67:

nonne libet medio ceras implere capaces  
quadrivio cum iam sexta cervice feratur  
—  
signator falsi?

3) lines 158-9:

qui dedit ergo tribus patruis aconita vehatur  
pensilibus plumis atque illinc despiciat nos?

The editors generally censure Juvenal for the digression on the *sportula*,<sup>3</sup> lines 94-136, but this is most carefully constructed

<sup>2</sup> Prof. H. E. Butler, *Post-Augustan Poets*, p. 292, is an exception: "No better preface has ever been written."

<sup>3</sup> H. L. Wilson *ad loc.* says "in lines 135 ff. the vice of *μονοφαγία* is taken up at greater length," and refers to A. Gercke, *Gött. gel. Anz.* 1896, p. 981, which I have not been able to see.

by Juvenal, and is the core of the poem, with its two dialogues, —an essential part of the *satura*. It begins:

quis fercula septem  
secreto cenavit avus? nunc sportula primo  
limine parva sedet, etc.,

and ends:

vestibulis abeunt . . .  
... caulis miseris atque ignis emendus.  
optima silvarum interea pelagique vorabit  
rex horum vacuisque toris tantum ipse iacebit.

Note the chiastic order, a b c c' b' a': a. secreto cenavit, a'. tantum ipse iacebit; b. sportula, b'. caulis—atque ignis emendus; c. primo limine, c'. vestibulis. This is obliterated by the apparently universal practice of putting a paragraph before line 127,

ipse dies pulchro distinguitur ordine rerum:  
sportula, deinde forum, etc.

But the whole point of the digression is the relation of the modern patron and client, and the attendance through the day is an important part of the subject. Some editors here complain because Juvenal does not give a full account of the day, but this would have lengthened the digression.<sup>4</sup>

For the chiastic order at beginning and end, compare lines 85 sqq. of the episode of Eppia (VI. 63-113):

immemor illa domus et coniugis atque sororis  
nil patriae indulxit plorantesque improba natos,  
... reliquit.

with lines 111 sq.:

hoc pueris patriaeque, hoc praetulit illa sorori  
atque viro.

Here the correspondence is still more marked a b c d d' c' b' a': a. coniugis, a.' viro; b. sororis, b.' sorori; c. patriae, c.' pa-

<sup>4</sup> Compare the account of the lady's day in VI. 474 sqq.:

est pretium curae penitus cognoscere toto  
quid faciant agitentque die,

with Mr. Duff's note *ad loc.*

triae; d. natos, d.' pueris;<sup>5</sup> and the artifice is carried further. The extremes (a. coniugis, a.' viro, d. natos, d.' pueris) have the words changed, whereas in the means (b. sororis, b.' sorori, c. patriae, c.' patriae) the words are the same.

## I. 170 sq.

Experiar quid concedatur in illos  
quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina.

Does this mean much more than that Juvenal intended to take Roman subjects and not Greek myths? Just above he had spoken of Aeneas, Achilles and Hylas as contrasted with the objects of Lucilius' satires,—living men, *auditores*. Juvenal does not care for mythical subjects, but in his time attacks on contemporaries were impossible. So he takes a middle course, as indicated by "pone Tigellinum" line 155. Tigellinus implies Nero, i. e. an Emperor.<sup>6</sup> That even this middle course was not without its dangers is shown by the persistent story of the actor Paris and Juvenal's exile.<sup>7</sup> Compare Maternus and his *Cato*, Tacitus, *Dial.* 3. One might mention "Cleon," an anonymous pamphlet which appeared in England during the late war. It was documented like a doctor's dissertation, but the whole history of Cleon was told with the closest possible reference to a well-known public man of the day, and in view of "Dora's" activities the author was probably well advised not to sign his name. So too the objects of Juvenal's attacks were well known even though they were called by the names of former evil-doers, e. g. III. 53-4:

carus erit Verri, qui Verrem tempore quo vult  
accusare potest.

## SATIRE III.

Juvenal's craftsmanship in this poem has been so universally admired that it does not call for defence; however, some in-

<sup>5</sup> For similar examples in Catullus and Vergil, see my articles *C. R.* (1908) XXII, p. 180, and *C. Q.* (1916) X, p. 92, note.

<sup>6</sup> Compare Charles I and Strafford, "If he is Sejanus, I must be Tiberius."

<sup>7</sup> VII. 92, with the scholiast's note, and the statement in the *Vita*.

stances of symmetrical arrangement seem to have escaped notice. It is natural that the poem at the end should return to Umbrius and his wagon-load of household goods, but the correspondences in thought and language are remarkably close. First of all, in the last line (322) *auditor* of P, the Viennese fragment, and F, is supported against *adiutor* of the other MSS., if we note that

*Saturarum ego, ni pudet illas  
auditor gelidos veniam caligatus in agros*

is contrasted with lines 8 sq.:

*mille pericula saevae  
urbis et Augusto recitantes mense poetas.*

Here cool fields are contrasted with hot Rome, *caligatus* with *togatus* (implied, of course, of dress at the recitation in the city), *poetas* and their subjects from mythology with Juvenal and his satires. Compare the way *auditor* is used I. 1:

*Semper ego auditor tantum?*

(i. e. of mythological subjects) with the same word in I. 166 sq.:

*rubet auditor cui frigida mens est  
criminibus,*

(i. e. of satires).

Further, *Cumis*, line 2, is taken up by *Cumis*, line 321, the penultimate line.

Line 3:

*unum civem donare Sibyllae,*

balances line 320, third from the end:

*ad Helvinam Cererem vestramque Dianam.*

In each case there is a reference to the civic religious interests of the town.

In lines 4 sq.:

*ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni  
secessus,*

there is a contrast between the health resort of fashionable Rome and Juvenal's journey for rest to his old home in lines 318 sq., fourth and fifth from the end:

quotiens te  
Roma tuo refici properantem reddet Aquino.

The references to *raeda*, line 10, and *iumenta* and *mulio* 316 sq., are more obvious, but they help to illustrate the symmetry of the two passages.

With line 4:

*ianua Baiarum est et gratum litus amoeni  
secessus,*

compare Seneca, *Epist.* 55. 7: *hoc tamen est commodissimum in villa* (at Cumae) *quod Baia trans parietem habet* (i. e. next door); *incommodis illarum caret, voluptatibus fruitur.* Parallels to passages in Seneca are frequent in Juvenal, but I have not seen this one noted.

#### SATIRE VI.

167 sq.

*malo † Venusinam quam te, Cornelia, mater  
Gracchorum.*

As *Venūsina* is the quantity elsewhere (*e. g.* in Juvenal himself, I. 51) many editors print *Venustinam* after Bücheler. But, as licenses in the quantity of geographical proper names exist,<sup>8</sup> may not *Venūsina* be right? The point is good—a girl from a small country town contrasted with a Roman lady of high degree (so Friedländer). The same thought is expressed by Tacitus, *Ann.* IV. 3, in relating the adultery of the younger Livia with Sejanus. The enormity of the crime is enhanced by the fact that Sejanus came from Volsinii. *Illa, cui avunculus Augustus, sacer Tiberius, ex Druso liberi, seque ac maiores et posteros municipali adultero foedabat.* See Furneaux's note *ad loc.*, and compare Juvenal VIII. 237-8:

et modo Romae  
*municipalis eques,*

(of Cicero). The reference to Horace's birthplace is perhaps supported by the mention below of the country girl from Sulmo, Ovid's birthplace: *de Sulmonensi mera Cecropis* (VI. 187).

<sup>8</sup> *E. g.* VII, 15, *Bithyni.*

381 sq.

densi radiant testudine tota  
sardonyches, crispo numerantur pectine chordae.

Mr. Duff says *ad loc.*: "This does not mean that the strings are *counted* with the *pecten*, but that they, being numerous,<sup>9</sup> are struck, and compares line 169, *numerat* *triumphos*, giving also examples from Martial. He does not, however, quote Vergil, *Georg.* IV. 347:

aque Chao *densos* divum *numerabat* amores,

which may well be the origin of this meaning in the Silver Age. (Compare *densi* in the preceding line (381) of Juvenal with *densos* here.)

#### SATIRE X.

54.

The argument from symmetry may be employed again in defence of the MS reading *petuntur*, where Mr. Duff, following

<sup>9</sup> An objection has been raised here,—“Why should seven strings be *numerous*?” For the *numerousness* of the number seven, see “Tristram Shandy,” chapter XVII:

“I mean, answered Dr. Slop, he would be denied the benefits of the last sacraments.—Pray how many have you in all, said my uncle Toby, for I always forget?—Seven, answered Dr. Slop—Humph! said my uncle Toby; tho’ not accented as a note of acquiescence, but as an interjection of that particular species of surprize, when a man, in looking into a drawer, finds more of a thing than he expected.—Humph! replied my uncle Toby. Dr. Slop, who had an ear, understood my uncle Toby as well as if he had wrote a whole volume against the seven sacraments.—Humph, replied Dr. Slop (stating my uncle Toby’s argument over again to him). Why, Sir, are there not seven cardinal virtues? Seven mortal sins? Seven golden candle-sticks? Seven heavens?—’Tis more than I know, replied my uncle Toby.—Are there not seven wonders of the world? Seven days of the creation? Seven planets? Seven plagues?—That there are, quoth my father, with a most affected gravity.”

Mr. Herbert Richards, reads *putentur*.<sup>10</sup> In lines 8 sq., Juvenal says:

nocitura toga, nocitura *petuntur*  
militia;

(with *optantibus ipsis* in the line before). Surely this is taken up by lines 54, 55, where Professor Housman punctuates:

*ergo supervacua aut <quae> perniciosa *petuntur*?*  
*propter quae fas est genua incerare deorum?*

and sets the two lines in a paragraph by themselves. All the editors refer to line 346:

*nil ergo optabunt homines?*

This threefold repetition is characteristic of Juvenal, as I have tried to show on Satire I. Note also 103 sq.:

*ergo quid optandum foret ignorasse fateris*  
*Seianum.*

It may be noted that *opto* occurs eleven times in the satire, the last being in 346, quoted above. Then Juvenal goes on, lines 354 sqq.:

ut tamen et *poscas* aliquid voveasque sacellis  
·  
*orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano.*  
fortem *posce* animum, etc.,

where the difference is vital.

GERTRUDE HIRST.

BARNARD COLLEGE,  
COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

<sup>10</sup> In proposing *putentur* Mr. H. Richards said (C. R. II. 326) "the corruption may have arisen from the apparently similar 'nocitura petuntur' of line 8."

## REPORTS.

HERMES LVIII (1923), pp. 1-239.

Griechische Politik und Persische Politik im V. Jahrhundert v. Chr. (1-19). W. Judeich tries to establish the chronological sequence of events and thereby to clarify the policies of Athens and Sparta, respectively, in relation to the policy of Persia during the 5th century B. C. He rejects Kahrstedt's hypothesis of a Spartan-Persian peace, negotiated by Pausanias, as being without any foundation (cf. A. J. P. XLIV, 76). The peace of Kallias, although it was not a formal treaty, represented wise, mutual concessions. Athens now enjoyed for more than a generation the undisputed possession of her gains. The peace of Antalcidas (386 B. C.) illustrates the traditional narrow policy of Sparta.

Über die Ursprüngliche Reihenfolge Einiger Bruchstücke Heraklits (20-56). H. Gomperz, following the example of Paul Schuster, Bywater and Alois Patin, associates certain fragments of Heraclitus thereby gaining a deeper insight into their meaning. Diels, distrusting such 'arbitrary' attempts, grouped them under the names of the respective sources. Although H's style was aphoristic, he must have expressed himself with some continuity, as 24 transitions are made with  $\gamma\acute{a}p$ , 17 with  $\delta\acute{e}$  and 9 by means of  $kai$ ,  $o\ddot{u}v$  or  $\delta i\acute{o}$ . This computation does not include the particles that seem to have been added by the writers citing the fragments; on the other hand it is probable that they frequently omitted original particles. Gomperz estimates that the 132 genuine fragments with their 1472 words constituted nearly one half of Heraclitus' book, which makes it probable that some of the extant fragments were closely associated.

Lesefrüchte (57-86). U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff continues this series with numbers CLXXI-CLXXX (cf. Hermes LIV, p. 46). He discusses Lysias I, Hyperides' For Euxenippus, Theocritus VIII, which he considers to be spurious. The *'Αττικὸν Δεῖπνον* of Matron of Pitana etc.

Die Kürzenmeidung in der Griechischen Prosa des IV. Jahrhunderts (87-108). Fr. Vogel gives greater precision to Blass's discovery that Demosthenes avoided the succession of three or more short syllables, and presents in a table of all the speeches, the several ratios of occurrence per 100 lines of Teubner text. Thus the third Philippic (IX) has 6.32%, that is an average of less than seven occurrences for every 100 lines, and the speech On the Crown (XVIII), 3.85%, that is, less than four occurrences. Omitting XXVII, XXVIII and XXX, undoubtedly speeches of his youth, and the doubtful XLI and LV,

he finds the ratio for the rest of Demosthenes' writings to be 4.57%. In marked contrast with this low percentage, the undoubtedly spurious speeches have percentages ranging from 20.93% (VII) to 33.45% (IL), only the Neaira and Epi-taphius show respectively 17.05% and 6.64%. The low percentage in Demosthenes is unquestionably due to conscious effort; but Vogel believes that the percentages that he computed for his contemporaries, although they range in the neighborhood of 20% to 30%, reveal a delicate sense of rhythm in the prose writers of the IV century B. C., which is comparable to the feeling for meter and rhythm in poets. He gives tables for the orators: Lysias, Isocrates, Aeschines etc., and also for the writings of Xenophon, Plato, Thucydides, Herodotus, Polybius, Plutarch, Lucian etc. His comments on individual cases are interesting, as viz., that the *λόγος ἐρωτικός* of Lysias in the Phaedrus contrasts with its 24% of occurrences with the 19% in the rest of the speech; and that the variations in the style of Lysias' speeches include a variation in the succession of three or more short syllables. The Nomoi, Philebus, Timaeus, Critias, Sophistes and Politicus, generally regarded as works of Plato's advanced age, show among his writings the highest averages, just as these same dialogues show, according to W. Janell, the most careful avoidance of hiatus. The Characters of Theophrastus show greater care than his scientific works. Vogel seems to have found a criterion that may be of use in determining the genuineness of a work.

Miscellen: W. H. Baehrens (109-112) welcomes W. Otto's 'Zur Lebensgeschichte des jüngeren Plinius' (Sitzungsber. der Bayr. Ak. d. Wiss. 1919, 10) as containing a number of corrections of Mommsen's article in Hermes III, 31 ff. He upholds, however, Mommsen's year 93 A. D., as the date of Pliny's praetorship, against Otto's attempt to show that 95 A. D. was the correct date.—H. Heinze (112) thinks that Thyrsis in Verg. Bucol. VII 41-44 answers in the name of Galatea, just as Menalcas Bucol. III 78 answers in the name of Iollas, and Damoetas in Theocr. VI 21 in that of Polyphemus.

Ionische Geschichtsschreibung (113-146). E. Howald cites passages from Herodotus to show that his lack of patriotism is incompatible with the conventional conception of national historian "der die Schilderung der griechischen Freiheitskriege sich zur Lebensaufgabe wählt." This 'moral insanity' is not confined to the political sphere; but is equally striking in purely human affairs. His attitude is that of an amused observer, who is mainly interested in the psychology of the individual, in his love, hate, cruelty, desire for power and gain, and takes note

of the ups and downs of human fortune. His aim is to entertain, hence while furnishing knowledge of a superficial kind, he is partial to marvellous tales, and is careful to avoid the tedium of long stories and a rigid scheme of narrative. Howald thinks, however, that these characteristics were not so much individual with Herodotus as they were peculiar to the mercantile atmosphere of Ionia, where material prosperity was prized higher than national freedom. An instructive parallel may be found in Boccaccio, whose similar characteristics were due to the commercial life of Florence. The 'Kaufmannskultur reichgewordener Städte' accounts for Herodotus' mentality; but his style was after all artificial. It had become good form not to apply moral rules, but to observe without showing emotion, to show interest in anything human, and above all to seek variety (*ποικιλία*). The struggle of the Greeks with the people of the Orient formed the framework of his history. This furnished a thread to which he could attach all manner of digressions, long or short. These *λόγοι* are the main thing in the first books. It is a mistake to regard the Egyptian and Scythian *λόγοι* as originally distinct works. It is also wrong to seek everywhere for sources. For Herodotus was a *λογοποιός*, who did not hesitate to incorporate material from any source whatsoever and to elaborate it as freely as a poet. Thucydides adopted this artistic freedom in his speeches in spite of his general condemnation of an *ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παραχρῆμα ἀκούειν*. Herodotus' history must have made a strange impression in the mother country where democracy and rhetoric held sway, a world that was unfamiliar with the Kaufmanns-kultur of Ionia. But towards the end of the century the moneyed aristocracy of Athens began to look with favor on the culture of Ionia. Kritias, Lysias, Andocides and even Plato show it in their style. Later, especially in Alexandria, the influence of this Ionic style is apparent. To show this Howald analyses the works of Callimachus.

Über die Proömien des Lukrez (147-174). K. Barwick does not accept Jacoby's complicated solution of the apparent dualism in the introduction of Book I (cf. A. J. P. XLIV 73); but lets two distinct prooemia follow the prayer to Venus (1-43), viz. a (v. 136-145 + 50-61) and b (62-135 + 146-148). Now as Mehwaldt (A. J. P. 32, 467) has shown that Book IV was written before Book III, the order of composition must have been: I, II, IV, III, V and VI. It is therefore a striking fact that prooemium b in Book I resembles the prooemia of Books III, V, and VI, especially in eulogizing Epicurus; whereas the other, simpler prooemium a falls into a class with the prooemia of Books II and IV. Hence it appears that when Lucretius came to compose Book III he wrote a more elaborate prooemium.

mium, including a eulogy of Epicurus, a plan which he followed in his introductions to Books V and VI. This accounts for prooemium b of Book I, which evidently was intended to replace the other simpler one, but as it was probably written on a separate sheet, confusion was wrought in the later editing. There are of course many details. He finally disposes of Mussehl's elaborate attempt to show that the order of composition was: I, II, V, IV, III and that Book VI was worked out in stages during the composition of V, IV, and III. Barwick finds that his order agrees with the order of Epicurus' own work, as shown in his letter to Herodotus.

**Diktyenna (175-186).** E. Maass elucidates the fragment in Oxyrhynchospapyri IV (1904) p. 63, no. 661 which tells of the pursuit of a female, who jumps into the water and is caught in a net, thereupon a second pursuit and, by conjecture, the death of the second pursuer. The female was evidently the goddess Diktyenna, who was originally an earth divinity, as shown by the literature dealing with Britomartis in Crete, Aphaia in Aegina and Laphria in Argos and Cephallenia. The legend of the pursuit was originally located in Aegina and from there was brought to Crete by Aeginetan settlers where Minos became the first pursuer, and as the goddess fled to Aegina the original pursuer was now the second. This expanded legend is the subject matter of the papyrus fragment. The name Diktyenna — Diktya was explained by the legend of the net (*δίκτυον*), but its origin is due to the use of nets in the cult of certain divinities, which in turn arose from attributing a mystic meaning to nets used as ornaments. Accordingly nets and fillets on sacred objects that were held to be a kind of palladium, came to be regarded as mystic bonds of supernatural strength. This explains the Delphic omphalos, covered with a sculptured network, which closed the spot where the earth-spirit fled from Apollo (cf. Apocalypse 20, 2). The article contains other interesting details.

**Die Feldzüge Antiochos' des Groszen nach Kleinasien und Thrakien (187-229).** O. Leuze determines a number of chronological points in the history of Antiochus' campaigns, as Niese is frequently mistaken and Bevan avoids a decision in chronological controversies.

**Die Zeitbestimmung von Hypereides' Rede für Lykophron (230-237).** A. Körte shows that the second speech for Lykophron (Oxyrhynchus-Papyri XIII pp. 74 ff., no. 1607), which is not by Hyperides, to whom Grenfell and Hunt were inclined to attribute it, as it shows a careful avoidance of hiatus, reveals that Lykophron tried to influence Dioceippus against the mar-

riage of his widowed sister to Charippus by sending a letter to Olympia where Dioxippus was to be crowned for a victory. As the date of this victory was 336 B. C., and the trial took place three years after the sister's marriage, it becomes evident that the speech that Hyperides delivered must be dated much later than c. 341 B. C., the date that has been assumed. The excessive zeal of Lykurgus for the purification of morals is discussed.

Miscellen: J. Mussehl (238-239) interprets Martial IX, 95 as a play on alpha and omega. Alphius, once an intimate of Athenagoras, coipit nunc Olphius esse, uxorem postquam duxit Athenagoras. A similar interpretation explains Anth. Pal. XI, 15.—F. Jacoby (239-240) thinks a lacuna in Athenaeus VIII 333 A can partially be filled by means of the glossary P. Ox. 1801, which shows that Phylarchus had mentioned locusts, which were common in Cyprus, Cyrene, Barce, Aethiopia, etc.

HERMAN L. EBELING.

---

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA E DI ISTRUZIONE CLASSICA, Vol. LI  
(1923.)

Pp. 1-5. Gaetano De Sanctis and Augusto Rostagni. Editorial announcement of plans for the 'new series,' which begins with this fifty-first volume.

Pp. 7-39. Augusto Rostagni. The first instalment of a study of Empedocles' *Kaθappaōi*. An attempt to reconstruct the argument of the poem, and to indicate the Pythagorean elements it contained.

Pp. 40-60. Vincenzo Ussani. A very readable essay on Fronto, written to serve as a chapter in a history of classical literature. The writer follows, in the main, the Latin text as given in the recent edition of C. R. Haines (Loeb Classical Library). Incidentally, he quotes a highly complimentary estimate of Fronto from the poet Giacomo Leopardi.

Pp. 61-70. Vincenzo Costanzi. The Lion of Chaeronea. The writer is inclined to agree with Beloch, that the monument was erected by Philip, not by the Thebans.

Pp. 71-77. Angelo Taccone. A defense of the MS reading *παρειπων*, in Sophocles, Antig. 369—"or s'egli intreccia (*oppure* mette a lato) le leggi del paese e la giustizia giurata ai Numi, etc." The word alludes only to Creon.

Pp. 78-100. M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis. On the law of the 'correptio iambica,' and the 'correptio trochaica et spondaica.' The shortening cannot always be explained as due

to the accent. From the beginning, there was a certain amount of laxity in Roman prosody, especially in the Comedy. Some of the 'shortenings' may really be cases of synizesis. The fact that the law operates only within the thesis or arsis of a single foot suggests that the poet was merely taking advantage of the 'prosodic oscillation' of the language.

Pp. 101-130. Reviews (The Oxyrhynchus Papyri, Part XV; T. Frank, Vergil: a Biography; A. Schulten, *Avieni Ora Maritima*; etc.).

Pp. 131-140. Notes and news.

Pp. 141-144. List of new books received.

Pp. 145-166. Ettore Bignone. Discussion of the fragments of Antiphon's *Aletheia* (Pap. Ox. 1364, 1797). This is Antiphon the sophist—apparently a different person from Antiphon the orator.

Pp. 167-186. Gaetano De Sanctis. A study of the Athenian archons of the third century. The writer quotes and discusses an important inscription from Salamis, published by A. D. Keramopoulos, Athens, 1923.

Pp. 187-194. Nicola Festa. Extracts from Florus in the Scholia on Petrarch's *Africa* (Ep. I 18, 15-37; I 22, 1-35). The text is quoted from Cod. V (= Marc. Ven. XII 17).

Pp. 195-216. Lorenzo Dalmasso. On the lexical notes in Aulus Gellius. The first instalment deals with the formation of words.

Pp. 217-232. G. Bendinelli. The "year's work" in Archaeology and the History of Art (a new feature of the RIVISTA).

Pp. 233-256. Reviews and book notices.

Pp. 256-268. Notes and news (a report of the fourth session of the International Academic Union, at Brussels, April, 1923).

Pp. 269-272. List of new books received.

Pp. 273-286. J. Beloch. On Phaedrus of Spethos, an Athenian statesman in the first half of the third century. A decree in his honor is given in I. G., II<sup>2</sup> 1, 682.

Pp. 287-308. Gaetano De Sanctis. A study of the Athenian inscription published by E. Ziebarth in 1898, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXIII 27 ff.

Pp. 309-332. Ettore Bignone. A study of Pap. Ox. 1797 (Part XV), continued from p. 166.

Pp. 333-343. Vasile Pârvan. I. *Ordessos* = Odessa (Russia). The ancient mention of an *Odessus* (or *Ordessus*) on the

north shore of the Black Sea seems to be an error. Pliny probably transferred the name from the Thracian Odessus. II. *Uscudama* = Adrianopoli. The name should be written *Uscudava*, a city founded by Dacians who came from the valley of the Oescus. *Dava* means 'city.'

Pp. 344-350. Bruno Lavagnini. On the etymology of *meftis*. The word is probably Oscan, from a root \**medh*, 'to intoxicate.'

Pp. 351-353. Angelo Tacccone. On Soph. Phil. 1092 ff. In 1094 read ἐλῶσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἵσχω. In 1092 for εἴθε read εἴτε. The meaning will be, "Ormai su per l'etra in alto i timidi augelli con lo stridulo soffio de' venti trasvoleranno; ch' io non posso ormai trattenerli!"

Pp. 354-384. Reviews and book notices.

Pp. 385-396. Notes and news (archæological, bibliographical, etc.)

Pp. 397-400. List of new books received.

Pp. 401-423. Augusto Rostagni. Filodemo contro l'estetica classica. I: Composizione e nesso logico del V libro Περὶ ποιημάτων. Discussion of Ch. Jensen's *Philodemus: Ueber die Gedichte*, Fünftes Buch, Berlin, 1923. Neoptolemus was Peripatetic, rather than Academic.

Pp. 424-467. Giovanni Capovilla. Il dio Heron in Egitto. The worship of Ἡρών (called Ἡρώς in Callimachus, Epig. 25) was introduced into Egypt by Thracian mercenaries, early in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus.

Pp. 468-484. Lorenzo Dalmasso. On the lexical notes in Aulus Gellius. II. This instalment deals with Graecisms.

Pp. 485-502. Reviews and book notices (L. A. Michelangeli, *Anacreonte e la sua fortuna nei secoli*; G. Giarratano, M. Val. Martialis *Epigrammata*; etc.).

Pp. 503-507. Notes and news.

Pp. 508-512. List of new books received.

W. P. MUSTARD.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.

## REVIEWS.

A Study in the Commerce of Latium. From the Early Iron Age through the Sixth Century, B. C. By LOUISE E. W. ADAMS. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College Classical Studies, Number 2.

Miss Adams has dealt with a precarious subject in a skilful and interesting way. For although both her subject and her period are among those for which definite data are almost always insufficient and in innumerable cases entirely lacking, she has through nice discrimination and a wary use of sources arrived at highly probable conclusions.

She begins with an account of the earliest maritime expeditions in the Mediterranean and then passes to a discussion of the "Civilization in Latium in the Early Iron Age" (Chap. I), "The Great Period of Importation" (Chap. II), "The Overland Route from Etruria" (Chap. III), "The Etruscan Occupation of Rome" (Chap. V) and "Rome's First Commercial Treaty" (Chap. VI). A classified bibliography (pp. 73-77) gives selected titles in "Commerce and Colonizing," "Chronology and Characterization of the Iron Age," "Topography," "Latian and Etruscan Material of the First and Second Periods of the Iron Age," and "Races of Italy."

In sketching the background of her subject in the Introduction, Miss Adams fully recognizes the importance of the maritime trade carried on by the Ionians but is manifestly not willing to join the ranks of those who are inclined to doubt the great activity of the Phoenicians in over-seas commerce. Whether these Phoenicians, who she believes were the first traders to visit the West coast of Italy, carried goods of their own manufacture is not clear. Nor does it matter very much. In the early Iron Age at least they seem to have traded very little with Latium. The eastern objects of this period found in Latium seem to have been obtained by trade with other Italian peoples. On the north were the Etruscans, in the south the Greek colonies of Campania, and it was inevitable that some of the trade and cultural influences that manifested themselves in these regions at an early date should in some slight degree appear in Latium. At this period, however, the influence seems to have been almost negligible. Through the eighth century the Latins, as compared with their Etruscan or Campanian neighbors, remained an almost hopelessly provincial people.

Perhaps the most interesting part of Miss Adams' dissertation is her reconstruction of the overland trade-route from Etruria to Campania. Like many of her other theories her views

in regard to this road are based solely on archæological material. Believing that the objects found in the Bernardini and Barberini tombs at Praeneste indicate the presence of ruling Etruscan princes in that city (cf. Curtis in *Memoirs of American Academy*, Vol. III and Frank in his *Economic History of Rome*), she sees in it the key fortress that commanded the line of trade between Etruria and the South of Italy. From Caere on the Etruscan coast the road ran to Veii, then into Latium, passing through Fidenae, Gabii and Praeneste, and on into Campania. As evidence of the probable connection between Praeneste and Caere, Miss Adams draws attention to the striking resemblance between the furniture of the two tombs mentioned above and that of the famous Regulini-Galassi tomb in Caere. If her conclusions are sound, commercial relations with Etruria and the South were established in the eastern part of Latium at an earlier date than in Rome, and in the seventh century Praeneste was far superior to Rome in culture and in the range of its commercial relations. Rome's power was increasing, but her trade, like that of the other communities in Latium between the Tiber and the Alban hills, was for the most part of a local and restricted character.

Praeneste did not maintain her prestige. In the sixth century the Tarquins, raiding Etruscan princes from Tarquinii, seized Rome just as in all probability their fellow-countrymen had captured Praeneste in the preceding century. A period of expansion for Rome followed. The trade from Veii that had once followed the road to Praeneste was diverted to Rome, and that city and all the towns in its neighborhood began to get the benefit of a commerce the ramifications of which extended far beyond local boundaries. It was then for the first time that Rome could be said to participate directly in Mediterranean trade. With the expulsion of the Tarquins this expansion ceased, and during the period between 509 B. C. and the end of the fourth century Rome not only did not extend her commercial relations with the East but she did not even hold her own.

In her discussion of the treaty with Carthage, the author follows Nissen and Frank in accepting Polybius' date, 509 B. C. If she has not completely established her case here, she has at any rate pointed out the weaknesses of Mommsen's arguments for the date 348.

Miss Adams has given us a stimulating and suggestive monograph. She should increase our obligations by pursuing the subject into the later centuries.

GORDON LAING.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

An Aristotelian Theory of Comedy, with an Adaptation of the Poetics and a Translation of the 'Tractatus Coislinianus.'

By LANE COOPER. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1922. xxi + 323 pp.

The common belief that Aristotle treated the subject of comedy in some chapters of the *Poetics* that are now lost—often spoken of as the lost second book of the *Poetics*—is based in part upon the following considerations: In chapter 3 of the *Poetics* he speaks of Aristophanes by the side of Homer and Sophocles, apparently regarding him as the representative of comic poetry as they were the representatives of epic and tragic poetry respectively. Then in the beginning of chapter 6, before taking up the discussion of tragedy, he says that he reserves until later a discussion of the epic and comedy, but, while he fulfills this promise as regards epic poetry in chapters 23 and 24, he nowhere includes a discussion of comedy in the *Poetics*, as we have it. Furthermore, in two passages of the *Rhetoric* we are told that the various kinds of laughter have been enumerated and analyzed in the *Poetics*, a statement which can not be verified in the extant work, and yet four other references to the *Poetics* in the *Rhetoric* can be verified.

A tenth-century manuscript in the De Coislin collection in Paris contains a theory of comedy in a condensed form, the source of which is to be sought in some able thinker of antiquity. Kayser who has given careful study to this *Tractatus Coislinianus*, as it is called, regards it as the most valuable of the ancient treatises on Greek comedy for an investigation into the history of the art of poetry. Its manifest kinship to the *Poetics* of Aristotle was noticed by Cramer, who first edited it. Bernays in his reconstruction of the Aristotelian theory of comedy made the De Coislin Tractate his basis, because he believed that it was derived ultimately from Aristotle; and he supplemented it with the few direct references to comedy in the *Poetics*. But whereas Bernays subordinates the *Poetics* to the Tractate, Professor Cooper in his reconstruction subordinates the Tractate to the *Poetics*, holding that by far the greater part of an Aristotelian theory of comedy is to be found in the *Poetics* and treating the authentic elements of the Tractate as an addendum. Furthermore, he takes issue with the opinion of Bernays and others that Aristotle underrated Aristophanes and preferred Middle Comedy, and he argues convincingly in his excellent chapter on "Aristotle and Aristophanes" not only that Aristotle was interested in Aristophanes and did not underestimate him in comparison with later comic poets, but that he recognized his genius and appraised his worth correctly, and

was the same penetrating and incisive critic in his judgment of Aristophanes as in his judgment of Sophocles and Homer.

Professor Cooper's reconstruction of Aristotle's theory of comedy from the *Poetics* is derived not only from what is actually said about comedy but also from what may be inferred from the statements about other forms of literary art; for much of the *Poetics* in its present shape is implicitly applicable to comedy and may be made directly applicable with a little manipulation. Hence, assuming that the scientific method employed by Aristotle in the investigation of comedy was virtually the same as that used in the case of tragedy and epic poetry, Professor Cooper re-writes the *Poetics* with such changes as are required to make it a treatise on comedy. "The essence of my procedure," he says, "is to make the necessary shift in the *Poetics*; to work back and forth from principles in that work to examples in comedy; and to use the Tractate as important but subsidiary, adding examples to illustrate it, after the fashion of Starkie, from Aristophanes, Shakespeare, Molière, and other sources." In this new version of the *Poetics* as it applies to comedy he has produced a companion volume to his "Amplified Version" of the *Poetics* which he published in 1913, and he has incorporated in it, within brackets, illustrative examples and timely comment as in the earlier work. In the present volume the adaptation of the *Poetics* to comedy is followed by (1) a translation of the De Coislin Tractate from the text of Kaibel, (2) an amplification of the Tractate and extensive illustration of its various categories from Aristophanes and others, as indicated above, (3) a translation of John Tzetzes' remarks on comedy in his First Proem to Aristophanes, and (4), as an appendix, the author's article on "The Fifth Form of 'Discovery' in the *Poetics* of Aristotle," reprinted and adapted from *Classical Philology* 13, 251-61. An Introduction of 165 pages precedes the body of the work.

In this Introduction many matters of interest are treated, none more interesting than the discussion of the effect of comedy. What in an Aristotelian theory of comedy would correspond to the catharsis of pity and fear which is the proper effect of tragedy? What emotions does comedy relieve? Plato associates anger and envy with comedy in the *Philebus*, and the analysis of anger and envy in the *Rhetoric* of Aristotle has many points of contact with that in the *Philebus*. Quintilian too sees a relation between laughter and the emotions of anger and envy. Make an angry or envious man laugh with pleasure and he will cease to be angry or envious. In this way anger and envy may be said to be purged away by comedy. On the other hand, a different effect of comedy is indicated in the Tractate, when it is said that comedy 'through pleasure and laughter effects the purga-

tion of such emotions.' If this is not merely a clumsy imitation of Aristotle's words in the *Poetics* about the function of tragedy, it may mean that the audience at a comedy by giving vent to the risible faculty finds relief in this emotional discharge. This is the catharsis of laughter. It must be noted, however, that we have no unmistakable traces of a theory of comic catharsis by Aristotle, nor a definition of comedy by him implying such catharsis.

It is fortunate that the transformation of the *Poetics* into a treatise on comedy has been made by so competent a scholar and one so familiar with the *Poetics* as Professor Cooper, and by one, moreover, who estimates it so highly. 'The *Poetics*,' he says, 'is the only adequate investigation of a literary type with regard to form and function that we possess, and that too in spite of the numerous critical works that have sprung from its loins; . . . . for method and perspective it never has been equalled in its field.' And he quotes Croiset to the effect that it is a masterpiece with a value well-nigh eternal. He has, furthermore, made accessible to students of 'English' and to classes in the drama the *Tractatus Coislinianus*, "the most important technical treatise on comedy that has come down to us from the ancients." To two of the categories of the Tractate, namely, comic dancing and the parts of *διάνοια*, he has given special study, and the illustrations of these topics are his own contributions.

It is true that the text is uncertain in the example of paronymy that Tzetzes gives to illustrate his fourth kind of comic diction, but, if one accepts the text that Professor Cooper (pp. 234, 288) follows, namely, Μώμαξ καλοῦμαι Μίδας, Μώμαξ well illustrates paronymy in that it is derived as a character name from the stem of *μώμος* by the addition of the familiar name-forming suffix *-άξ*, and has about the same meaning (baring the element of the nickname) that *\*μωμητής* had, if it existed. The passage means "Mr. Faultfinder is the name they give me Midas." It is not, therefore, correct to say, as Professor Cooper does on page 234, that "the proverbial jocular derivation of *Middleton* from *Moses*" applies to Μώμαξ and Μίδας here, nor to translate "I Momax am called Midas." And a knowledge of Fick's great work on proper names would have kept him from saying that "Middleton from Moses . . . . illustrates the case of proper names derived one from another by clipping or addition or both." So also Στραυνίας in Aristophanes' *Frogs* 22 is a character name, and consequently the translation "Dionysus, son of — Old Beerbarrel" gives the tone better than "Dionysus, son of — Wine-jar," as Professor Cooper has it on pages 241 and 250 *bis*. (Compare *Class. Phil.* 2, 462; *A. J. P.* 42, 160.) But these are small

matters, and they do not detract from the general excellence of the work. The book deserves high commendation; it is a fine contribution of American scholarship, all the more remarkable because the author is not primarily a classicist; yet his contributions to classical study both in his teaching and in his published work win for him a worthy place in the ranks of classical students, and surely classicists would be proud to claim him.

CHARLES W. PEPPLER.

TRINITY COLLEGE, N. C.

---

Early Latin Verse. By W. M. LINDSAY. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1922. 372 pp. 8°.

For the student of Plautine verse this is a very important book. It is written by the man who for a great many years has been the most eminent of living Plautine scholars and may, we believe, be regarded as rounding out a long period in the development of the subject. Of course, the book has the qualities that we have always associated with Lindsay's name—extreme accuracy and a consummate command of the material. Among many excellent features of the work we would call attention especially to the list of words the prosody of which in Plautus requires special treatment (pp. 186-221) and to the exceptionally fine lists of material (on word-divisions within feet) found on pp. 82-105.

Mention should be made particularly of the second chapter (over a hundred pages) on *Plautus and Menander*. Lindsay gives us a careful comparison of Plautine and Menandrian usage, which seems to be the chief new contribution contained in the book. All of the chapters are good, but I was especially impressed with the fourth, on *Early Latin Meters*, which runs for over fifty pages and is thickly strewn with rich and varied learning. Then follow four lists of material and a good bibliography.

Lindsay's main aims, as stated on p. viii, are (1) to illustrate spoken Latin from Plautus and to throw light on peculiarities of literary Augustan forms, (2) to prepare the way for an adequate presentation of Plautus' lines by editors,—the drift is, we should say, towards a marked text—(3) to vindicate Plautus' artistic skill.

However, it is well to remember that the metricians are split on the problem of form. Lindsay belongs to a linguistic school that approaches the subject from the side of the material, the *ρνθμιζόμενον*. There is another school, that of the so-called new metric, or the higher metric, that makes its approach from the

side of the form, the *ρυθμός*. There are two kinds of metric: the ordinary, or traditional, metric and the Aristoxenian metric. For the former the meter is a simple succession of either feet or dipodies; for the latter the meter is a very complicated affair, built up out of overlapping blocks of felt portions of duration. The Plautine problem, up to and including Lindsay, has been handled on the basis of the non-Aristoxenian metric. The new metric is at bottom a revival and an extension of Aristoxenian thought. Hitherto this so-called new metric has for the most part been confined to Greek, but it is bursting its bounds there and is coming across into the Plautine problem. The result is an extreme conservatism in textual matters combined with an enormous complication of metrical doctrine.

The Plautine problem hinges on attitude towards conjectural emendation. Lindsay belongs to a school that frequently resorts to conjecture, not because the sense demands it, but purely for the purpose of simplifying the metrical problem. The question is whether the problem is as simple as Lindsay would have us believe, or whether he has merely put in metrically easy substitutes for things he does not understand. In Plautus the traditional metric demands a considerable amount of conjectural simplification of the metrical form presented by the manuscript tradition; but on the basis of an extension of Aristoxenian thought it is possible to get along with practically no conjectural emendation for purely metrical purposes. Which way is right?

Lindsay's attitude, or at least his possible attitude, towards the manuscripts may be illustrated from p. 108 of his book, where he would make his point by altering about forty lines. With this passage may be contrasted the lower part of p. 7 of Wilamowitz' paper on *Isyllos von Epidauros*. When a man has to 'emend' away the evidence of forty lines of text in order to make his point, we are not very enthusiastic believers that he is right. There is another way of explaining that material, according to which we do not need any alterations and simplifications of the traditional form of the particular verse.

It is a remarkable thing that the most of the alleged metrical mistakes of the scribes take place in the arses, the unictuated portions, of the feet. In his treatment of word-division within resolved feet (pp. 80-105) and of the corrections (pp. 35-59) Lindsay seems to attach no importance to this fact. We are not willing to believe that the scribes had the wonderful faculty of making mistakes in arses and of avoiding them in theses. The arsis is naturally the more unstable part of the foot, and we would rather believe that there are certain minute points of technique that the Plautine scholars have not understood.

The manuscripts give evidence of three kinds of so-called corrections, i. e. iambic, trochaic, and spondaic combinations functioning as pyrrhics. The Plautine scholars have recognized

iambic shortenings, but have tried to emend the trochaic and spondaic combinations away. But according to the manuscripts (as well as the inscriptions), these trochaic and spondaic functional pyrrhics are found only in arses and for the most part only in certain feet. Why should they be emended away?

In Greek and Latin there is a mass of tortuous detail having to do with the technique mostly of the arses of certain feet, especially of normally dipastic feet. There is a doctrine that the meters are mere successions of either simple feet or dipodies, but on that basis why should one foot be different from another? And yet the technique of the arses of the different feet is different. In the case of classic Latin verse, e. g., Lucian Mueller, building mostly on the work of Moriz Haupt and Lachmann, accumulated a bristling array of detail having to do especially with the collocation of proper names and with word-division and elision in connection with the arses of the various feet. In the classic Latin poets the harsher elisions in the various meters go into the arses of the same feet in the arses of which in Plautus lie the combinations that the Plautine scholars would emend away. That means, we believe, that the basic rationale of the meters is the same both in Plautus and in classic Latin verse. In general it is the same arses that in Greek verse are the seat of irregularity. We have here a problem that in its earliest form—it was then a Greek problem—dates back about 175 years to Richard Dawes (see White, *Verse of Greek Comedy*, p. 50, n. 1). In its wider aspects the problem has in Plautus been acute since Ritschl. The present writer does not believe that the Plautine scholars have got anywhere near the bottom of the matter.

The Plautine scholars admit irregularities in the arsis (the unictuated portion) of the first foot of the colon in iambic and trochaic verse: those arses can be treated as if they were dactylic and not iambic or trochaic arses. But §§ 70 and 205 of White's *Verse of Greek Comedy* suggest that we extend the doctrine in Plautus beyond the first foot of the colon to either foot of the first dipody of the colon. Then there is a further complication in both Greek and Latin. Caesural segments are in effect sorts of *cola*. For instance, the iambic trimeter and the iambic senarius after the penthemimeral caesura in effect end in a catalectic trochaic dimeter, and the arses of the first dipody of this dimeter may have dactylic peculiarities. For this dactylic motif in Plautus, as is well known, a cretic can be substituted, and (a thing that is not well known) either or both longs of this cretic can be resolved.

The admission of the pertinence of the ideas that we have suggested above would render superfluous a very large part of Lindsay's attempts to simplify the metrical material. We illustrate the matter from the fourth and the fifth feet of the iambic

senarius. In the inscriptions we find such lines as these (Buecheler's *Car. Lat. Epig.*) :

64, 1 hic est sepulta Pacilia Sospita *pia proba*,  
 67, 4 némine úmquam débūi uixi quòm fidè,  
 175, 1 quod facere nati parentibūs debuerunt suis,  
 175, 3 quod debuit filius parentibus officium praestare,  
 187, 1 dum uixi, uixi quomodo condecet ingenuom.

When such verses occur in Plautus, Lindsay says that the manuscripts are corrupt (*op. cit.*, pp. 91 f.) ; but why should he?

Again he would not admit as possible in Plautus things much milder than some of the following epigraphic examples (cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 87-90) (C. L. E.) :

37 moram si quaeris, sparge míliu(m) et collige,  
 85, 1 decem et octo annorum nátus uixi ut potui bene,  
 3 ioceris, ludas hortor: hic súmma est seuéritas,  
 100, 3 eques sepultus híc sum natus ánnos octo èt decem,  
 103, B, 5 paréntes amáuit, n[ostram] duxit] coniugem,  
 108, 8 genuítque ex mé tres nátos quos relíquit parbulos,  
 113, 3 prudèns demándat ná[tos] paréntibùs,  
 4 gestis honóribu[s] uixit ánnis trigínta s[éptem],  
 7 prudens demandat náto[s] maríto karíssimo,  
 8 lucemque caruit. uixit ánnis uigínti séx,  
 141, 5 iugumque coniugálem pudícum piússimo,  
 195, 1 ita candidatus fíat honóratus tuus,  
 2 et ita gratum edat múnus tuus múnnerarius.  
 3 et tu (sis) felix, scriptor, si híc non scripseris.

But why not admit what we can explain? These feet can be anapaestic. We cite a remarkable Greek example, the only Greek instance of the 'cretic' motif with which at present I am acquainted (F. D. Allen in *Papers Am. Sch. Clas. Stud. Athens*, IV (1885-6), p. 47),

Δημαινέτης εíμì μνῆμα τῆς Λαμψαγόρεω.

Note the trochaic swing.

Lindsay has given us a very learned and very accurate work, and some of his lists of material are worthy of all praise. But in metrics Lindsay is an empiricist without any comprehensive body of fundamental doctrine. The newer movements in metrics are away from Lindsay. He has given us an easy exposition of a simplified Plautine problem. We are of the opinion that the heart of the Plautine problem lies in the material that Lindsay would explain away. Lindsay's scheme merely pushes the problem out of Plautus over into the popular inscriptions. The Plautine problem, down to and including Lindsay, has been handled without taking into consideration the evidence of the inscriptions. It has been fashionable to pooh-pooh the metrical inscriptions; but we are entering into a time of severer ideals, and when we can explain what is on the stones, we do not need to simplify what is in the manuscripts.

GILBERT H. TAYLOR.

## BOOKS RECEIVED.

**Anthologia Lyrica.** Edidit E. Diehl. I. Poetae Elegiaci. II. Theognis, Carmen Aureum, Phocylidea. III. Iamborum Scriptores. IV. Poetae Melici. Monodia. Lipsiae, *In aedibus B. G. Teubneri*, 1922, 1923. 492 pp. 12°. (Teubner text edition.)

**Baldwin** (Charles Sears). *Ancient Rhetoric and Poetic.* New York, *The Macmillan Company*, 1924. 261 pp. 12°.

**Campbell** (James Marshall). *The Influence of the Second Sophistic on the Style of the Sermons of St. Basil the Great.* Diss. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. II.) *Catholic University of America*, Washington, D. C., 1922. 156 pp. 8°.

**Delatte** (Armandus). *Catalogus Codicium Astrologorum Graecorum.* Tomus X. Codices Athenienses descriptis Armandus Delatte. Brussels, *Maurice Lamertin*, 1924. 291 pp. 8°.

**Flom** (George T.) *The Language of the Konungs Skuggsia (Speculum Regale).* Part II. Pronouns, Numerals and Particles. The Verbs and their Conjugations. (University of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. VIII, No. 4, November 1923.) *University of Illinois Press*, Urbana, Ill.

**Frank** (Tenney). *Roman Buildings of the Republic.* (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, Vol. III.) Rome, *American Academy in Rome*, 1924. 149 pp. Small 8°. \$2.50.

—. *Storia economica di Roma.* Tradotta da Bruno Lavanini. Firenze, *Vallecchi Editore*, 1924. 274 pp. 12°. 12 L. unbound.

**Hayward** (Arthur L.) *Colloquial Italian.* New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1924. 136 pp. 12°. \$1.60.

**Jews and Christians in Egypt.** Illustrated by texts from Greek papyri in the British Museum edited by H. I. Bell, with three Coptic texts edited by W. E. Crum. London, *British Museum*, 1924. 140 pp. + plates. Small 4°. 10/ net.

**Keith** (A. Berriedale). *The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin, Development, Theory, and Practice.* New York, *Oxford University Press, American Branch*, 1924. 405 pp. 8°. \$7.00.

**Mackay** (Donald Sage). *Mind in the Parmenides.* A study in the history of Logic. Columbia University Diss. 114 pp. 8°.

**Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome.** Volume IV. Rome, *American Academy*, 1924. 180 pp. + plates. Folio.

**Oxyrhynchus Papyri**, Part XVI. Edited with translations and notes by Grenfell, Hunt and Bell. London, *Egypt Exploration Society*, 1924. 280 pp. + 42 pp. of indices + plates. Small 4°.

**Reynolds** (Reverend Graham). *The Clausulae in the De Civitate Dei of St. Augustine.* Diss. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. VII.) *Catholic University of America*, Washington, D. C. 67 pp. 8°.

**Velleius Paterculus.** *Res Gestae Divi Augusti.* With an English translation by Frederick W. Shipley. London, *William Heinemann*; New York, *G. P. Putnam's Sons*, 1924. (Loeb Classical Library.)

**Wyld** (Henry Cecil). *Studies in English Rhymes from Surrey to Pope.* A chapter in the history of English. New York, *E. P. Dutton & Co.*, 1924. 140 pp. 12°.